DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 160 031 HE 010 497

AUTHOR	Anderson, John W.; And Others
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Small College Consortium, 1977-78. A Title III Project. Part II: Case Studies.
INSTITUTION	Small Coll. Consortium, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Jun 78
NOTE	119p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Small College Consortium, 200 P Street NW, Washington, D.C. 20036
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Change Strategies; Church Related Colleges; *Consortia; Developmental Programs; Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Interviews; Liberal Arts; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; Program Evaluation; *Small Colleges; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS	*Institutional Development

ABSTRACT

An external evaluation of the Small College Consortium (SCC) was designed to evaluate and make recommendations for linkages between the delivery of technical assistance services and progress toward institutional development. The case study component of the SCC evaluation for 1978 was undertaken as two separate but complementary analyses. The two methods were a hypothesis-free case study analysis and an issues-based functional analysis calling for intensive interviews and other data collection. In the first analysis, the evaluators found 10 institutional characteristics that best helped explain differences in progress toward institutional development in the eight colleges visited. These were grouped into four categories: characteristics of the top administration, faculty morale, availability of resources, and use of change agents. In the second analysis, evaluators found clear evidence of high quality technical assistance in all areas assessed. The results were somewhat mixed, however, from school to school. The most commonly used strategies (oncampus consultation workshops, and seminars) were found to be effective for those institutions in early developmental stages, whereas more advanced institutions were likely to need a broader range of services covering expanded topics. The evaluation team concluded that significant development is taking place at member colleges, and that most developmental efforts are attributable directly or indirectly to SCC staff involvement. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED160031

AN EVALUATION OF THE SMALL COLLEGE CONSORTIUM, 1977-78

A TITLE III PROJECT

PART II: CASE STUDIES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Small College
Consortium

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

HE 010 497

Small College Consortium
Institutional Development Project

AN EVALUATION OF THE SMALL COLLEGE CONSORTIUM, 1977-78

A TITLE III PROJECT

PART II: CASE STUDIES

John W. Anderson
Edward F. Kelly
David C. Munz
Jon F. Wergin, Chairman
Francis J. Wuest

June 30, 1978

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The case study component of the SCC evaluation for 1978 was undertaken as two separate but complementary analyses. One methodology, an hypothesis-free case study analysis, was carried out as follows: SCC staff members selected eight member colleges to represent a range of participation in the technical assistance areas, levels of involvement with project functions and staff, and perceived levels of developmental activities on the campuses. Two-day site visits were scheduled at these colleges for pairs of evaluation team members between late April and early June, 1978. Visiting evaluators were given little if any preliminary data about the college; the purpose rather was to conduct an independent analysis of institutional development by interviewing top and middle level administrators, the On-Campus Coordinator, key faculty members (whether involved with the project or not), and students. The resulting assessments of institutional development and the role the SCC played in that development were organized into case studies, one per college. These appear in Appendix 1.

The second methodology, an issues-based, functional analysis called for intensive interviews by two members of the evaluation team with each of the five technical assistance specialists on the SCC central office staff, plus the executive director. The purpose of these interviews was to elicit staff perceptions of functions, activities, hypothesized outcomes, and areas of concern pertaining to each area. Each interview was followed by data collection via surveys and telephone interviews with college personnel with whom the staff member had worked as a technical specialist during the year. The nature of the questions asked and the data obtained varied among the five areas depending upon the focus and emphasis of the initial staff interviews. Data from each TA area were analyzed separately, and the results of these analyses appear in Appendix 2. In all, a total of 50 colleges were contacted as part of either or both methodologies just described.

The evaluation team convened in mid-June to share and synthesize their findings. The hypothesis-free synthesis is provided in Section II; the issues-based synthesis is provided in Section III of this report. As both methodologies studied similar phenomena, particular attention was given to areas of overlap between the two. Overall conclusions are given in Section IV. A summary of the two syntheses and the conclusions is provided below.

Hypothesis-free synthesis. The evaluators found ten institutional characteristics that best helped explain differences in progress toward institutional development in the eight colleges visited. These were grouped into four categories: characteristics of the top administration, faculty morale, availability of resources, and use of change agents.

A. Characteristics of top administration.

1. Presidential profile. The particular management style used by an individual president seemed less important to institutional development than the strength and consistency of his or her image.

2. President's future plans. Institutional development seemed considerably more tenuous in colleges where the president's future plans were uncertain, or where a replacement for a retiring president had not been found.

3. Top level administrative balance. "Strong administrations" were most often characterized by a complement of roles and personalities.

B. Faculty morale.

1. Perceptions on use of college personnel. Faculty members at the eight colleges tended to be more enthusiastic about the project when they felt their own strengths were being used constructively, not manipulated through "ritualistic" activities.

2. Acceptance of decision-making style. While no "best" style of decision-making was found, a critical factor was the degree to which a particular style was accepted by the college community.

3. Justification for change. Lack of clearly delineated and widely accepted needs often led to aimless planning and "change for change's sake."

C. Availability of resources.

1. Financial resources. Institutional development was most likely to take place when the college was faced with a moderate financial pinch; colleges tending toward either financial security or financial crisis were less conducive to development efforts.

2. Prospects for obtaining students. While the student market was tight for all schools studied, one of two quite different marketing problems was faced: an exclusive but dwindling pool of applicants, or a larger pool for which the college was forced to compete with other institutions.

D. Use of change agents.

1. The OCC's ability to manipulate local norms. The key to the On-Campus Coordinator's effectiveness was not a particular change strategy employed, but rather the ability to recognize and deal with the tradition and culture of the school.

2. Use of outside consultants. Development efforts were considerably enhanced when college personnel were able to specify their expectations of a particular consultation and knew in advance what the consultant had to offer.

A single organizing concept was found to permeate all of the above factors, which the evaluators chose to call "institutional self image": i.e., the degree of comfort people in the college had about their institution's purpose and future direction.

Issues-based synthesis. The evaluators found clear evidence of high quality technical assistance in all TA areas assessed. The results were somewhat mixed, however, from school to school. The most commonly used strategies--on campus consultation, workshops, and seminars--were found to be effective for those institutions in early developmental stages, whereas more advanced institutions were likely to need a broader range of services covering expanded topics. In addition, progress toward institutional development varied according to the characteristics of the TA area: greater success was apparent in areas where effectiveness was defined as the learning of specific information, skills, and methods; less success was apparent in areas encompassing a complex combination of activities focused on interpersonal, conceptual, process and value issues. The TA areas comprising retention and admissions, marketing, and management information systems were found to be more successful, for the reasons listed above; in contrast, no clear-cut pattern emerged for areas dealing with curriculum development and professional development.

Three recommendations obtained from the above observations: a reassessment of ideal delivery modes, greater attention to information dissemination, and greater intra-staff coordination.

Observations drawn from the separate TA evaluations suggested the following summary statement:

> Effective delivery of TA services for comprehensive, integrated, holistic institutional development requires that selected characteristics of strategies chosen for TA delivery be matched to selected characteristics of institutions receiving the services.

Four institutional characteristics appeared to be the most critical: 1) stage of institutional development; 2) stage of institutional readiness; 3) rate and direction of institutional development; and 4) level of entry (i.e., as the focus of TA delivery shifts from a specific problem to program development to system development, so must the characteristics of the delivery itself change). Critical characteristics of TA delivery were: 1) characteristics of the TA area; 2) delivery capability; 3) range of effective delivery modes; and 4) staff operating styles.

Six practical considerations were offered as specific recommendations to SCC staff. These were to: 1) assess the effective range in terms of both intensity and frequency of on-campus contacts; 2) anticipate institutional needs; 3) be sensitive to the energy of on-campus personnel; 4) disseminate information about available SCC services and scheduled events selectively to potential users at all levels; 5) develop an internal system to coordinate staff activities; and 6) model the sort of comprehensive, integrated, holistic behavior that is being sought in member colleges.

Overall conclusions. The evaluation team concluded that significant development is taking place at member colleges. The team concluded further that most development efforts are attributable, directly or indirectly, to SCC staff involvement. Two concerns were noted as points which, if addressed, should help strengthen the project's effectiveness. The first concern was a certain ambiguity of function, roles, and project ownership. While this was seen to be a reflection of project complexity, it reinforced the importance of planning and coordinating efforts at both the staff and college levels. The second concern dealt with an apparent means/ends confusion: use of "change" in the colleges and "activity" among the staff as ends in themselves.

All of the observations extracted from the case study data led the evaluators to recast the concept of "institutional development" as a series of three stages through which both SCC staff and member colleges must move together: beginning with scattered, somewhat disjointed activities; moving to lowered expectations and a sense of what works and does not work; and ending with integrated efforts focusing on incremental effects. The evaluators noted further that while none of the colleges studied in 1978 have yet reached this third stage of development, several are fast approaching it; and that helping other member colleges do the same will be a major challenge for the SCC in the coming year.

Finally, the evaluators introduced the notion of "mutual accountability" as a summary recommendation: that SCC staff and member colleges have both the right and the responsibility to ask hard questions of one another. Accomplishment of mutual accountability from the SCC staff perspective may require some internal office reorganization; accomplishment of mutual accountability from the colleges' perspective may require greater analysis of how they use consultants.

The undersigned have participated in preparation of Part II: Case Studies for the 1977-78 external evaluation report of the Small College Consortium Institutional Development Project.

John W. Anderson, Ph.D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Economics
Bucknell University

Edward F Kelly
Edward F. Kelly, Ph.D.
Associate Director for
Research and Evaluation
Center for Instructional
Development
Syracuse University

David C Munz
David C. Munz, Ph.D.
Professor and Director
Applied-Evaluative Research
Program
Department of Psychology
St. Louis University

Jon F. Wergin, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Educational Planning and
Development Program
Medical College of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University

Francis J. Wuest
Francis J. Wuest, Ph.D.
Program Director
Center for Institutional
Development
Kansas City Regional Center
for Higher Education

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to acknowledge the assistance of several persons who contributed to the evaluation of technical assistance delivery.

Nancy Mattei made a major contribution by conducting many of the telephone interviews and assisting with analysis and interpretation of data.

Gray Jacobik and Diane Weyermann helped with the preparation and distribution of survey instruments, arranged interview schedules, and, generally, helped the evaluation to go smoothly through their thoroughness and attention to detail.

Camille Geoff and Claire Wuest were their usual helpful selves--typing, editing, proofreading--while working calmly on tight schedules.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Section I: Purposes and Methodology 1

Section II: A Synthesis of Eight Hypothesis-Free Case Studies 7

Section III: A Synthesis of Issue-Focused, Functional Analyses 13

Section IV: Impact Evaluation, A Final Synthesis 25

Appendix 1: Eight Case Studies 29

- College A: A Small Evangelical Christian Liberal Arts College 31
- College B: A Small Catholic Women's College 35
- College C: An Evangelical Liberal Arts College in an Affluent Suburb 41
- College D: An Organization Faces Maturity 47
- College E: A Small Evangelical College Experiencing a Year of Healing 53
- College F: A Small Catholic College for Women 61
- College G: A College Facing the Risk of Institutional Development 67
- College H: A Typically Unique Small College 73

Appendix 2: Issue-Focused, Functional Analysis of Five Technical Assistance Delivery Areas 79

- A: Management Information Systems 81
- B: Enrollment Development 91
- C: Curriculum Development 103
- D: Marketing 107
- E: Professional Development 113

SECTION I: PURPOSES AND METHODOLOGY

PURPOSES

This external evaluation of the Small College Consortium was designed to serve the following major purposes:

1. To evaluate the linkages between the delivery of technical assistance (TA) services and progress toward institutional development.

2. To provide Small College Consortium (SCC) institutions and the SCC staff with recommendations for the improvement of these linkages.

To accomplish these two major purposes, the following specific objectives provided direction for the evaluation design:

Hypothesis-Free Case Studies

Using a selected sample of institutions from the SCC: a) assess progress toward institutional development; b) examine the process of institutional development in this sample for generalizations applicable to other settings; and c) synthesize these results into a set of institutional characteristics which facilitate or impede institutional development.

Issue-Focused, Functional Analyses

Using a selected sample of services from SCC technical assistance (TA) areas: a) assess the effects of TA delivery on specific problem areas of the SCC institutions; b) examine the process of TA delivery as represented by the selected services studied for information about staff effectiveness and effectiveness of delivery modes; and c) synthesize these results into a set of TA delivery characteristics which facilitate or impede institutional development.

Impact Evaluation

Using the results from both sets of assessments describe the current linkages between TA delivery and institutional development and recommend actions and strategies for improvement.

Communication

Present the results of this part of the external evaluation to SCC staff, SCC institutions, and the U. S. Office of Education via a written report.

The report contains: a) A statement of purposes, evaluation, structure and methodology, b) Synthesis of Hypothesis-Free Case Studies, c) Synthesis of Issue-Focused, Functional Analyses, d) Summary of the Impact Evaluation, e) Appendix 1, Eight Hypothesis-Free Case Studies, and f) Appendix 2, Five Issue-Focused, Functional Analyses of TA Service Areas.

STRUCTURE

The major components of the evaluation design were:

Hypothesis-Free Case Studies of eight institutions.

Issue-Focused, Functional Analyses of five TA service areas.

Impact Evaluation based on the results from the case studies of eight institutions and the functional analyses of five TA delivery areas.

METHODOLOGY

Hypothesis-Free Case Studies: Eight colleges were selected from the 54 SCC institutions. Selection was based on the *a priori* criteria of involvement (with SCC to bring about institutional development) and activity (institutional effort, in general, to bring about development). Colleges were selected by the SCC staff to represent various combinations of these two criteria plus some distribution of participation in the various technical assistance areas.

All five evaluators visited colleges. Each college was visited by a two-person team. The on-site visits followed the format used by last year's evaluation team. Each visit covered three calendar days, starting late in the afternoon of the first day and ending in the early afternoon of the third day. Evaluators spent an extended period of time with the On-Campus Coordinator typically starting and ending the visit with her or him and having a few shorter meetings during the visit. The President, Academic Vice President or Dean, and members of key faculty committees were interviewed in each case. Beyond these persons, other administrators, faculty members, and "opinion leaders" from any segment of the campus community were also interviewed, including those who were members of the loyal opposition and outright critics of the developmental activity. With few exceptions, each person interviewed met with one or both evaluators alone for 30-90 minutes. In a few instances group interviews (e.g., with the members of an educational policy committee) were held. The schedule of persons interviewed varied somewhat from campus to campus depending on the emphasis of the program and the availability of key figures. Generally, all persons central to the program were seen during the visits.

In order to achieve the purposes of the evaluation, the evaluators focused on six questions. Obviously, different combinations of these questions were emphasized with different interviewees depending on their respective roles in institutional development efforts. The questions were as follows:

1. How and by whom was the focus for institutional development identified? What is the sequence of major events undertaken during this year?

2. From your perspective, what are the major barriers/facilitating conditions for institutional development at your institution?

3. What strategies (implicit/explicit) for institutional development are being used? by whom? Give concrete indicators of what strategies are being used and how. How do these strategies relate to barriers/facilitators? What is the prior institutional history/experience with developmental strategies?

4. What is your perception of progress regarding institutional development? Using concrete criteria to support your conclusion, how do you know that progress has been made?

5. What is there about the strategies for development that has made them work or not work? What are major institutional constraints and unexplored opportunities?

6. Relate your institution's developmental activities to your personal and institutional expectations, to your understanding of the expectations of the staff of the Small College Consortium, and to the overall objectives of the SCC.

At the start of each interview, evaluators stated that the case studies were to be descriptive, not judgmental, that perceptions and impressions of what happened were as valuable in shaping the case studies as were "facts," and that institutional participants would have an opportunity to critique the case study reports before they were put in final form.

Upon completion of the interviews, one of the evaluators drafted a case study integrating all of the available data. The draft was shared with the partner in evaluation to check for clarity and accuracy. A final draft was submitted to the OCC at each institution for reaction and comment.

As a final step, the five evaluators examined and synthesized the results from the eight case studies. The authors of each case study identified critical forces in the process of institutional development and suggested institutional characteristics that produced effective or ineffective progress at each institution. Following a critical review of this material, the evaluators narrowed the materials to a set of institutional characteristics which facilitate or impede institutional development.

The synthesis is presented in Section II of this report. The reader is encouraged to review the detailed case studies presented in Appendix 1. In doing so, it should be understood that the synthesis is an analysis of the case studies from the perspective of the five evaluators. There is an inferential leap from these case study presentations to the synthesis of important characteristics of institutions which facilitate or impede institutional development.

Issue-Focused, Functional Analyses: Five specific TA areas were chosen for analysis: Management Information Systems, Enrollment Development, Curriculum Development, Marketing, and Professional Development. These TA areas were the ones the SCC staff believed represented their major efforts over the last year.

In order to assess the effects of TA delivery on specific problem areas chosen by SCC institutions, the two evaluators who were responsible for this component of the evaluation effort worked with SCC staff to uncover underlying issues in each TA area. These issues were used to focus assessment instrumentation on the important aspects of TA delivery. Functional analysis data were collected through interviews with SCC staff, telephone interviews with college personnel, and questions responded to by college personnel.

The following steps were taken to reach the objectives of this evaluation component:

> A three-hour interview with the SCC staff member responsible for each TA area to elicit a description of activities, strategies, and perceived effects as the basis for jointly defining assessment issues;

Design of instruments to collect data and identification of samples of institutions and key persons from whom data were to be collected;

Collection of data and compilation of information into interpretable form;

Review findings for each area with the specific SCC staff member and solicit his/her reactions;

Review all findings with SCC director;

Prepare a report for each TA area describing findings and conclusions;

Examine findings and conclusions for general information about staff effectiveness and effectiveness of delivery mode;

Synthesize these results into a set of TA delivery characteristics which facilitate or impede institutional development.

The synthesis is presented in Section III of this report. The reader is encouraged to review the detailed TA reports presented in Appendix 2. Again, the synthesis is an analysis of the results of the functional analysis of TA areas from the perspective of two of the evaluators. There is an inferential leap from the TA area data to the synthesis of TA delivery characteristics.

Impact Evaluation: In order to evaluate the linkages between the delivery of technical assistance services and institutional development, the five evaluators reviewed the results from both sets of assessments. From these assessments they described what they perceived to be the current linkages between SCC technical assistance delivery and the progress institutions were making toward development. Recommendations for improvement were generated from this description. Section IV contains a summary of the Impact Evaluation.

SECTION II: A SYNTHESIS OF EIGHT HYPOTHESIS-FREE CASE STUDIES

The eight colleges included in these case studies share a number of superficial characteristics. All are small, private colleges. All have important religious ties. The majority of their students come from within a 200-mile radius. All face intense competition for students, yet in only one case did enrollment decline last year. While these schools were picked in order to give a cross section of ways in which the SCC staff members were utilized during the year, they also appear to be fairly typical of the 54 schools which belong to the consortium.

The two-person teams which visited each campus did not begin with any hypotheses concerning organizational change. Rather their purpose was to interview a wide variety of administrators, faculty, and students on each campus to obtain their perceptions as to the facilitators and barriers to change. In reviewing these case studies, the evaluation team detected 10 basic characteristics which seemed helpful to understanding institutional change. The sample was small and the schools have rather special characteristics. Therefore, no claim is made that this list applies to all institutions of higher learning, nor did we discover any unique combination of factors which might explain why one school might have made more progress than another. Rather the list of site characteristics was found to be a helpful diagnostic tool for understanding differences between colleges and may be helpful for planning strategies for obtaining institutional development. One final point - the list may not be exhaustive. An advantage of the case method is that it permits - even invites - the reader to develop his or her own analytical framework for understanding organizational change.

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TOP ADMINISTRATION

Since these colleges are small organizations, the top administration plays a more important role in shaping their character than do administrators of larger organizations. Few may notice the change of a president at a large university. Such a change at a small college is an important event. A new president can have a considerable impact upon small colleges in a remarkably short period of time. The unusual aspect of this sample is that there is active consideration being given to obtaining a new president in six of the eight schools.

1. Presidential Profile

The Presidents of the eight schools had very different management styles. At College D the President was seen as a "benevolent dictator," at College B as an inspirational leader who strongly supports participation in decision-making. The President of College H described his style as a "mixed bag." The President of College G is noted for his "energy," but this is quite different from the "forcefulness" of the President from College B. The "informality" of President A is different from that of President H.

These Presidents also play a variety of external roles. The President of College C has a radio ministry which helps shape the school's recruitment and fund-raising. The President of College H has close ties to the local business community, and these affect the college's rules for student conduct. College F's President is a leader in her religious community, and this helps determine the college's organizational structure. The President of College E is an internationally known pastor of his denomination, and this plays an important role in student development.

The important thing about these different presidential profiles is not that one works better than another. What appears to be more important is how sharply the profiles are etched. For example, change at College D can be swift partly because the President plays such a key role in decision-making. Change at College B is more organic because of a belief in participation.

2. Future Plans of the President

In six of the eight colleges there was active consideration being given to selection of a new President. In some cases this was because the President was near retirement age (College C), in others it was because the President (College D) or the college (College E) was beginning to see a need to "move on." In several cases there was an immediate - in others an indefinite - retirement date, but in all cases the possibility of presidential retirement affected institutional development. The school is forced to reconsider the role it expects from a new president. College D has created a new "dual leadership:" the current President will become Chairman of the Board responsible for external affairs, while the new President will be responsible for internal affairs. They hope this will allow them to improve their financial development and also concentrate upon academic quality. In places where the President's future was uncertain, institutional development seemed considerably more tenuous.

3. Top Level Administrative Balance

The colleges showed a variety of combinations of roles for their top administrators. In College B the President was the inspirational leader of the community; the Academic Dean was task-oriented, and the Dean of Students, people-centered. The success this college has had with organizational development can be partially traced to the degree to which these roles complement each other. At College E problems seemed to exist because other administrators have created administrative roles which contradict the President's style. College G has had a high turnover of administrators because they have not found the right fit in administrative roles. The exact nature of these roles and the fit which produces the optimal balance seems to depend upon other characteristics of the college. There is no single best fit. If participation prevails, then one set of roles may be best; autocratic decision-making requires another set. But a variety of roles seems important: a "strong administration" usually has people who complement each other to achieve some balance. The importance of administrative complementarity was noted in last year's case studies, as well.

B. FACULTY MORALE

Faculty morale plays a key part in the success of institutional development, and the morale at this group of schools seemed to depend upon three issues: the utilization of people, their acceptance of the existing decision-making style, and their justification for change. Attitudes towards these factors help determine loyalty towards the college, the degree of trust within the organization, and the general *esprit de corps*.

4. Perceptions of How Well the School Utilized Its Personnel

The faculty at these colleges tended to have high morale if they believed that people at the school were being used effectively. The concern for personal growth is especially evident in the Catholic colleges where a special obligation exists between the individual and the religious order, although members of the Protestant schools had many of the same expectations. A college's participation in the SCC presented some particular occasions for personal growth. For one thing, the school had to fill the position of OCC and in doing so could use the tremendous energy of a faculty member (as in College A). For another, the availability of workshops, consultants, and even advisor visits to the campus gave people on campus the sense that personal growth was a concern of the college. Morale also seemed to be heightened at those schools which encouraged faculty members to teach new courses or develop new programs (College H).

5. Acceptance of the Current Style of Decision-Making

As noted in Point 1, no best style of decision-making was found at these schools. The critical factor which affected morale was the degree to which a particular style was accepted by the community. People at College D were reasonably happy with a benevolent dictatorship, but wide participation was the norm at College B. The acceptability of a particular style may depend, in part, upon the developmental stage of the college. Centralized decision-making can be acceptable in a new institution which is struggling to stay in the black. Widespread participation is thought to be too inefficient. But as an institution matures and the focus shifts from the budget to academic quality, greater faculty input can be seen as desirable. Other factors which determine this acceptability include the personal-spiritual strength of the President (College C), the tradition of the religious order (College F), and the power of the Board of Trustees (College E). College H is noteworthy because it lacked any apparent norm for decision-making. This might help explain why the college seemed to be drifting, without a guiding force at the top.

6. Justification for Change

Schools perceived the need for institutional change and attempted to obtain it in a variety of ways. At College G change seemed to depend upon the intuition of the President. Change at College E meant becoming more data oriented. Faculty morale can be affected when the justification for change is quickly modified. For example, at College A there seemed to have been a growing acceptance of a long-range planning process which was developed two years ago. Some faculty members were sorely disappointed when this process was abandoned in response to budgetary problems. Colleges that attempt to establish a rational planning model seem to be constantly tempted to revert back to a more intuitive response to change under stress. Indeed, there appears to be a growing feeling that the rational model may not be appropriate for small institutions which have so little control over external variables. Similarly, some colleges appeared to be operating under the principle, change for change's sake. Such activities may prove disappointing in the long run.

C. AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES

While characteristics of the administration and faculty morale are important variables, they are always affected by external factors such as financial resources and student markets. This interrelationship between internal and external forces is complex. For example, while a presidential profile helps determine the student market, the existing student market also affects the choice of college presidents.

7. Financial Resources

The level of endowment, access to external funding, and adequacy of the physical plant contribute to the development of a college. However, the relationship between these factors and institutional development is not a simple one. Change usually requires additional resources, but wealthy schools can become complacent and resist change. Necessity breeds invention. The OCC at College C complained that change was slow because there was no perceived need for change; "We're doing well now, thank you." College H is actively searching for new programs which will arrest the decline in student revenues. A tight budget may call for program elimination (although no major cutbacks have been made in this sample of colleges) or creation of new programs (as at Colleges G and H). The key may be that financial stress can encourage the establishment of new programs, but financial resources are required if these programs are to grow to maturity. On the other hand, a financially secure college needs forces other than financial stress to foster change.

8. Prospects for Obtaining Students

The student market is tight for all of these schools, but note the variety of market situations: College C is but one of 14 schools of higher education in their county, while College D is the only Catholic college in the state. College A is the only four-year degree college in a county of over 156,000 residents. Most of these schools seem to face a tradeoff. The more they differentiate their education from the mainstream, the smaller their student market becomes relative to the total population. But such specialization can allow them to develop important sub-markets which are not serviced by mainstream schools. Most of the colleges in this sample have experienced increasing enrollment as they have emphasized their religious ties and their particular blending of the liberal arts with career development. But colleges (such as College H) which have ties to a denomination with shrinking membership are being challenged to develop new programs which will attract a larger student base and yet still maintain their religious heritage.

D. USE OF CHANGE AGENTS

The last category of characteristics which help explain facilitators as well as barriers to change concerns the use of internal and external change agents.

9. The OCC's Ability to Manipulate Local Norms

Last year's case studies focused on the role of the OCCs and factors which determined their effectiveness as change agents. This year's study seemed to confirm these earlier findings. Again, no single style was found to be most effective. College B has participatory norms. Its OCC was effective insofar as she helped groups work through problem-solving. College F is moving toward a data-based style of management. Its OCC is effective because she is perceived as a data person. Fitting the OCC's abilities to a particular institutional development effort can present problems when that effort shifts over time. Thus the OCC at College C felt more effective his first year because he was a data person dealing with an MIS. This year the college focused on a more qualitative objective, administrative development, and he felt less satisfied with his experiences. College H presents an interesting wrinkle to this manipulation of institutional norms. Here the OCC was perceived as being "temporary." He was able to effectively break with college norms and not be seen as an empire builder, because he was not perceived as a regular member of the group. It will be interesting to see how permanent these new programs become and whether institutional norms will be modified by their success.

10. The Use of Outside Consultants

The schools used consultants in a variety of ways. In some cases consultants simply verified (or blessed) what had already taken place. In other cases, the consultant not only played an active role in the first stages of goal setting and strategy design but also worked through implementation stages. Some schools (such as College B) preferred to have consultants come to their campus; others (Colleges A and D) preferred to take teams off campus to learn. Some colleges developed close ties to the SCC staff (College A), others proceeded fairly independently of the SCC (College E). Details concerning factors which may allow effective use of consultants are elaborated in Section III of this report. The central finding of this section is that both schools and consultants need to know more about one another, including both the resources they have to offer and expectations they hold of the other party.

E. SUMMARY

A single organizing concept helps to summarize the different factors leading to institutional development. That concept is institutional self image. Colleges saw themselves in a remarkable variety of ways: College D as "young and agressive;" College A as "maintaining;" College H as an "invisible college." These self images are created from a variety of forces including the ten site characteristics just discussed. The unifying element is the degree of comfort people in the college community have about their institution's reason for existence, what it stands for, and where it's headed. In those colleges where incongruence was detected (i.e., conflict between the public and private image), or where the self image appeared vague and undefined (e.g., "We are not unique." "We are one of fifty colleges in the area."), attempts at institutional development seemed half-hearted, ritualistic, or fragmented, as if the college were grasping at straws. In contrast, in colleges staffed with enthusiastic people sharing both a sense of mission and a comfortable attitude toward their college's role in modern higher education, genuine institutional development seemed to be taking place. However, two nagging questions persist. How can the SCC help member colleges move from the former profile to the latter? How can member colleges utilize SCC resources to best facilitate that transition? Thoughts on these and other questions are offered in Section IV.

SECTION III: A SYNTHESIS OF ISSUE-FOCUSED, FUNCTIONAL ANALYSES

Assessment of performance in each of five specific TA areas (Management Information Systems, Enrollment Development, Curriculum Development, Marketing, and Professional Development) is reported in Appendix 2. Starting with the identification of issues/questions by the appropriate SCC staff member, the assessment of each TA area was structured to provide insight into SCC functioning. This approach was important to capture the distinctive quality of performance in different TA areas by different staff members. The results of that assessment were analyzed and then synthesized into the unified overview of SCC technical assistance delivery which follows.

Functional Analysis

There is clear evidence that the SCC staff has delivered technical assistance of high quality at high intensity. There were demonstrable positive effects in all TA areas assessed. Respondents confirmed that they acquired, through SCC involvement, information and skills of value in their local situation. In many instances what they learned was applied immediately in new or improved programs. While it is too soon to judge the long-term impact of these outcomes, it is clear that they are immediate, observable steps toward systematic institutional development.

Beyond establishing the existence of such effects, this stage of the evaluation is directed at understanding more about the processes which link the SCC efforts to institutional effects. Given the scale and complexity of this project, and the fact that five different TA areas were assessed, it should not be surprising to find the mixed set of results reported in Appendix 2. Yet, it is also clear that general conclusions can be drawn. From the five assessments, three broad statements descriptive of the process of TA delivery are presented.

1) The strategy used for TA delivery continues to be effective for a particular class of institutions, but a mix of strategies is needed as more institutions progress with their development. The staff designed a strategy based on identification of needs. Needs are identified by institutional personnel via the annual application to OE and in their growth contract with the SCC. In part, needs are also identified by the SCC staff via their regular advising visits to campuses. A further means for needs identification is the provision of SCC workshops and seminars designed to familiarize key institutional personnel with the substance and potential of available TA services in order that they can exercise better choices. Once a match is made between the perceived needs at an institution and SCC

capability, follow-up proceeds in many forms. The predominant delivery mode is on-campus through some combination of consultation, workshops, or seminars. In addition, other delivery modes are used: access to printed information, telephone consultation, referral to other agencies or individuals within the SCC, CASC, or elsewhere, as well as off-campus workshops and seminars sponsored by the SCC or others.

As a result of matching delivery to perceived need, the institutions value what they receive and communicate that to the staff. The SCC staff members feel that they are doing something important. Their morale is high and they invest considerable energy in project activities. At the same time, the staff senses that they cannot continue to ride on the successes of the past two years. The project is at a new level as a result of those successes. They must find ways to further the development of those colleges which have already benefited from TA services. The institutions more advanced in each TA area will need different kinds of services on new topics. The staff, working with the institutions, will have to identify specific types of services and the methods for their delivery. At the same time, in each TA area there are institutions less advanced, many of which have not yet requested SCC services. They have specific needs which could be met with TA services similar to those in use over the last two years. The question of how to bring these colleges into the process while serving the more advanced schools is difficult. It will have to be answered in practical terms if the SCC is to continue delivering effective TA service to its constituency.

2) Success, as indicated by implementation of specific methods or programs and by progress toward integrated institutional development, varied according to the characteristics of the TA area: a) There was greater success with TA delivery in areas in which success is based more on learning specific information, skills, methods; b) There was less success in areas which demand a comprehensive combination of activities focused on interpersonal, conceptual, process, and value issues.

a. Retention and admissions, marketing, and management information systems are the three areas of greater success. They are more easily promoted via specific skill training. More importantly, assistance in these areas is related to particular administrative offices and thus to specific responsible persons or groups, not to the entire institution or to all faculty or all students. Personal job satisfaction and career advancement are more clearly connected to learning in these TA areas. There is greater use of resources from the SCC and other institutions, and, generally, more integrated developmental activity among these three TA areas. In fact, it is as if there is a conscious strategy underlying this effort.

The strategy has these elements: Start by helping an institution address one immediate problem (e.g., attrition). Help key personnel to develop a retention strategy which starts them moving toward solving that problem. As your work with them on this immediate problem proceeds, get them to see that they have a broader, intermediate need (admissions management) that should be addressed if they are to be successful at reducing attrition. So, begin working on the improvement of the admissions program. In doing so, it will become clear that in order to create a solid, goal-oriented admissions program, it must connect with other programs (units, departments, offices, etc.) in a system embracing many components of the college. Other programs have information (data) that admissions must have if it is to be a sound program. An MIS designed to serve a program can link to other programs. Soon a broader view emerges. The college must move toward a systems approach to institutional development, i.e., one that is comprehensive, integrated, and holistic. The college that moves along this continuum, even if gradually, is surely making progress toward institutional development.

The previous scenario is over-simplified, but it captures the substance of what has actually happened at a number of campuses. The SCC staff has been able to work with these colleges in development from an initial focus on immediate problems, to developing intermediate programs, and thence on to creating systemic solutions which link all facets of the institution and thus benefit all.

b. No such clear cut pattern has emerged in curriculum development and professional development. The substance of these TA areas is perceived as less related to acquisition of skills or methods. More than one person or office is charged with responsibility for development in these areas, and authority is often spread quite diffusely. Without fail, attempts to move toward systems of curricular or professional development raise issues which are emotionally charged. For these and other reasons, persons on the campuses seem less sure of how they are to approach planning and development in these areas. They are, however, quite clear about identifying problems to be solved and needs to be met in these areas. The SCC staff feels frustrated. They are aware of the perceived needs and that they have had some successes in solving problems. They are also aware that progress has been made more slowly in these two TA areas than in the others. They find it difficult to engage institutions directly in rational, holistic programs or systems development. They feel that there is less or inappropriate use of them as resources, and that the institutions have a narrow problem-centered perspective about how these TA areas relate to institutional development.

This situation does not mean failure, for there has been sound progress made in these two areas in many institutions. It does identify a second problem to be solved. In addition to discovering how to deliver TA services to institutions at different levels of development and readiness, multiple strategies for TA delivery are needed as a function of the characteristics of different TA areas and the manner in which they are perceived at the institutions. Comments and observations by the SCC staff and institutional respondents suggest these possibilities among others: use approaches emphasizing organizational development rather than specific TA areas; utilize team approaches to linking these two TA areas together or with others; be sensitive to the need for institutions to progress to more integrated operations before taking on these areas.

3) Three procedural or methodological issues warrant evaluative comment: a) ideal delivery modes, b) information dissemination within the SCC, and c) appropriate models for SCC staff performance. These issues are related to the two major conclusions. Furthermore, positions held by the staff regarding these issues differ from what was found in the evaluation, or, in the absence of a staff position, the evaluation found data which suggest that these issues need to be explored further.

a. Ideal delivery modes: Three of five staff members believe that TA delivery is equated with as much presence on campus as possible; the more direct contact of any type, the better. Two other staff members are more selective in their campus contacts but still favor on-campus workshops tailored to individual needs over off-campus workshops. Responses from institutions suggest a broader view of delivery modes. They see advantages and disadvantages to both on-campus and off-campus events. There are times, in the judgment of some, when it is better for the SCC to be absent from campus. They also envision a range of delivery modes beyond those now in use, e.g., instructional audio and/or video cassettes, topical newsletters, programmed instruction modules, conference calls involving personnel at other SCC institutions working on similar problems, etc. In most TA areas there are prospective users who feel unable to take advantage of on- or off-campus workshops in perception between staff and users regarding ideal TA delivery modes suggests re-examination of present patterns.

b. Information dissemination within the SCC: This issue has two components: identity of the SCC including information about staff and services they offer; and delivery of information about SCC programs and events. Many of the institutional respondents equated the SCC with CASC (the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, SCC's assisting agency). It is understandable why this is so given the origin and early history of the project. However, the SCC has a definite identity which surely should be understood by its member institutions. In some cases institutional people knew neither who was on the SCC staff nor what services they provide. In a number of cases individuals spoke of immediate problems, not realizing that SCC provided TA services in these areas. There is the definite possibility, however, that if everyone who might use TA services attempted to do so, the SCC would be unable to deliver given the present staff size, mix of technical expertise, and delivery strategies.

There appeared to be cases, on the other side, where an OCC alone or in cooperation with a few key administrators was unconcerned about spread of information about the SCC. This was done either to focus the resources of the SCC on a single problem of priority or because a more closed style was consistent with institutional norms. A clearer, more broadly shared picture of the SCC and its capabilities for TA delivery seems desirable to improve and expand use of services. That is balanced by the need to match what is offered with what can be delivered while respecting institutional autonomy.

Important factors in the success of TA delivery are timeliness and quality of information. Generally, the SCC staff has done well in this area as reported by respondents. However, several requests for changes in information distribution were made. More advanced notice of off-campus events was desired, e.g., a minimum of 60 days notice to plan for team participation. Full descriptions of SCC events at the time of the first notice were also requested. These should include: purpose, intended audience, names of staff or presenters with brief resumes, schedule of events, expected outcomes, reading list if appropriate, etc. The point is to provide sufficient information for institutional personnel to decide if the event is appropriate for them, who should attend, and what they can do to prepare for it. Furthermore, it was seen as desirable to deliver materials directly to personnel likely to be benefitted by proposed events. At a minimum, mailings to Deans and Presidents in addition to OCC's were seen as helpful. Finally, there was a desire for better, more timely reports following on-campus events. This was seen as important for intra-institutional use of SCC resources beyond the initial, more narrowly focused contact.

c. Appropriate models for SCC staff performance: The SCC is designed to foster comprehensive, integrated, holistic institutional development. The staff apparently gives the impression to some of being a loose collection of one-person change agents on a whirlwind tour moving rapidly from college to college. That characterization is a bit extreme, but the point is that institutional respondents do sense, and react to, the image presented by the staff. Some reports implied disjointed staff activity, with each member focusing on his or her TA area and not always knowing what has happened at the same institution as the result of other SCC staff involvement. Such lack of coordination led to seemingly contradictory actions in one institution. The sheer intensity of energy invested by SCC staff is also sensed. For some institutional respondents it is intimidating. The feeling which already overextended, understaffed administrators have when facing heavy institutional pressure for immediate problem-solving is reflected in the following, "If I have to work like they do, on top of what I am already doing, to bring about institutional development, then forget it."

Behaviorally, the SCC staff is modeling, for some institutions, one thing while purporting to be about something else. Of course, there are too many institutions to serve in a calm, individualized style when the continuing existence of the project is contingent, in part, on annual demonstration of cost-effectiveness and satisfaction by a clear majority, if not all, member institutions. Establishing entry is, itself, an incredible task which takes considerable staff energy and the spreading out of SCC resources. Once working relationships have been established, usually through individual contacts, the staff may have to plan more systematically how they as a team will deliver TA services to a given college. A more focused, systemic relationship may ease some of the demands on institutional time and energy. Limitations on time and energy were mentioned without exception in all TA areas among the key barriers to development. Strategies based on more balanced systems considerations, rather than the frontal assault on each TA area, might ease this pressure.

Finally, these issues suggest that the SCC staff may want to apply its developmental strategy to itself. Development of an SCC MIS would ease some present problems and offer an operational model to its members. In other TA areas systems principles can be adapted for internal consortium development. At the outset, individualized, problem-centered entry was demanded. Now, many institutions are prepared to work on comprehensive, integrated, holistic institutional development. As a result of staff success in aiding this process through TA delivery, the SCC staff will have to develop accordingly if it is to continue serving these institutions effectively. This implies comprehensive, integrated, holistic consortium/staff development.

Synthesis

The conclusions drawn from the assessment of TA services fit together within a single organizing framework.

Effective delivery of TA services for comprehensive, integrated, holistic institutional development requires that selected characteristics of strategies chosen for TA delivery be matched to selected characteristics of institutions receiving the TA services.

Institutional characteristics: There are four institutional characteristics which appear to be most critical. We suggest that effective TA delivery is contingent on the ability of the staff to diagnose these institutional characteristics and, based on them, to design the SCC's overall TA delivery strategies and to select the particular TA to be delivered and its delivery mode for a given institution. The institutional characteristics are:

1) Stage of institutional development. Institutions within the SCC vary over a broad range of experience and success with institutional development. That range includes those which are at a pre-planning stage with fragmented start-up activity, to those which have implemented major components of a total system with the remaining components in development. The issue is how to communicate with persons at such different levels of experience in order to provide effective training, consultation, or other TA delivery.

2) Stage of institutional readiness. Institutions may select any given TA area as their primary concern. They may be at quite different levels of readiness to receive TA services in that area. An institution may designate curriculum development, but not have evaluated its present curriculum in relation to the needs of its clientele. Another may define its problem as "the admissions director must get 50 more students this year" not recognizing that attrition and retention together with marketing studies are the appropriate points to begin. Before any TA services can be delivered meaningfully in such cases, the institutions must be assisted in reaching the appropriate stage of readiness to receive them.

3) Rate and direction of institutional development. The higher the rate of development, the more anticipatory must TA delivery become. That will often require more flexible, intense contact over a shorter time period. It demands immediacy and specificity in meeting commitments, information exchange, and reporting. At lower rates of change the pace of TA delivery can be relaxed. Direction of development is important also. It cannot be assumed that all institutions will follow the same path to development. Differences in purpose, values, goals, strategies, and tactics abound. In some few

cases emergency conditions exist which, if not dealt with directly, could lead to institutional failure. Clearly, TA delivery at a single pace in a single direction will not be of maximal use to all institutions.

4) Level of entry (problem, program, system). As the purpose of TA delivery shifts from a specific problem, to program development, to system development, the characteristics of the delivery must vary also. One dimension is the increasing need for multiple TA areas to be represented. Another is the increasing demand for a systems approach to TA delivery, perhaps best done by a team. Another is the increasing need to consider organizational development including questions of governance, interpersonal communication, effective use of power and its distribution, etc., in addition to specific skill and information input.

Technical assistance delivery characteristics: Here, too, there are four critical characteristics. We suggest that design of TA delivery strategies must flow from the ability to diagnose institutional characteristics and needs. That design should consider these four TA delivery characteristics and thus enable staff to match characteristics in providing particular TA services to specific institutions.

1) Characteristics of the TA area. Technical assistance areas are inherently different. At a minimum, the broad distinction between areas which demand an emphasis on information skills and methods and those with greater emphasis on process, conceptual models, values, attitudes, and the interpersonal domain must be considered. This is a matter of emphasis and not a natural dichotomy. In fact, as progress is made through levels of entry (problems to programs to systems), the emphasis in all areas shifts toward the latter set of characteristics. Inherent differences within TA areas demand an exploration of variations in delivery strategies and modes designed to work with these differences.

2) Delivery capability. There is a fixed number of staff members with particular expertise and a fixed amount of money available for each project year. TA delivery must be designed within those constraints. Given that success with institutional development increases the range and complexity of demands made for TA delivery, resource development and management within the SCC staff become increasingly important. Without it, the consortium could be ruined by success. Concurrent with the delivery of present TA services, it is necessary to develop new services and new delivery capabilities. That in

itself requires personnel, money, and sufficient lead time for development before the need can be met. Recognizing that the project is subject to annual renewal, a condition which can work against ongoing resource development, a more modest goal may have to be substituted. Review of the present strategy of assigning individuals to specific TA areas and having all staff responsible for advising is probably necessary. Teamwork and more extensive use of individualized institutional materials and information dissemination may provide for increased delivery capacity. Whatever approach is used, more is needed than the fixed scheduling of events "because I think we need them" and the exhausting travel from campus to campus because "our presence is important."

3) Range of effective delivery modes. More than off-campus workshops or seminars followed by on-campus workshops or consultation is seen as desirable by institutional respondents. Independent of the need for improved delivery capability, this issue demands a response. An appropriate mix of delivery modes increases the likelihood of reaching more of the prospective TA users in more effective ways. Again, there are costs in money, time, and human resources entailed in developing this system. Whether or not it can be done under present conditions, it remains as a critical characteristic of the design of effective TA delivery systems.

4) Staff operating styles. The SCC staff sees itself, and is seen by others, as operating with a mix of styles. Two dimensions appear to be central in defining each staff member. The first is the emphasis on information and skill transfer ranging from heavy content to less content and more process. The second is the extent to which interpersonal (staff-institutional personnel) relations is emphasized ranging from working relations emphasizing support and caring through the completely impersonal. There are advantages and disadvantages to all combinations of these styles. Given the mix of tasks and staff operating styles, delivery can be effective or ineffective depending on the match with institutional characteristics.

Two possibilities for design seem appropriate in this area; staff development to increase the range of styles available to each staff member and/or greater attention to matching staff style to institutional characteristics, expectations, and the nature of the immediate task. The latter implies teamwork where staff with different operating styles share responsibility for TA areas.

Practical Considerations for Effective TA Delivery

Whether or not a full-scale diagnostic and resource development system is developed to match TA delivery strategies to institutional characteristics, there are six practical considerations for movement toward more effective TA delivery.

1) Assess the effective range (both intensity and frequency) of on-campus contacts. More is not always better. No action can sometimes be effective. Timing and quality of TA delivery appears to be more critical to success.

2) Anticipate institutional needs, and then prepare institutions for optimum information assimilation and application. Increase staff capability to judge what is needed, when, and how long it will take to reach stated objectives at each institution. Plan use of staff time accordingly. Tell institutions and other SCC staff what you know and why you are doing what you are doing.

3) Be sensitive to time and energy levels and the energy reserve available to institutional personnel. Pace the rate and intensity of delivery and the delivery mode (e.g., self-paced versus workshop; process consultation vs. skill training; etc.) to the energy level of individuals with whom you work. Timing can be critical in this regard also. November may be a great month for a curriculum development workshop with a faculty committee, but a terrible time for work with admissions personnel.

4) Disseminate information about available SCC services and scheduled events selectively with an eye to potential users at all levels, including Presidents, Deans, and OCCs. At present the staff cannot assume that everyone it wants to know about SCC services does so, at least not in time to make full use of them. A brief announcement in each TA area would be helpful if it covered these points: definition of the area, how it relates to institutional development and other SCC TA areas, available services, conditions of delivery, staff credentials, staff expectations, hints on effective utilization of services in each area, scheduled events, and likely future events. The SCC is delivering a variety of distinctive products via particular strategies. Potential users need to know this to make optimum use of them.

5) Develop an internal MIS to structure and guide the above activities. Emphasize capacity for anticipatory, timely, and matched responses to institutional need. Incorporate a system for on-going internal evaluation to guide future development of the SCC.

6) Model comprehensive, integrated, holistic behavior in the development of the SCC. Incongruity between staff behavior and what it purports to be doing can be destructive. Attempting to complete a systems design for the SCC, while working with institutions, can be instructive to all involved. It may be the only way in which the project as a whole can meet its long-term objectives for effective TA delivery.

SECTION IV: IMPACT EVALUATION, A FINAL SYNTHESIS

This section is, in effect, a "systhesis of syntheses." The previous two sections each reflect a distillation of specific, detailed information covering a host of activities, outcomes, and hypothesized intervening variables. Taking the process one step further, by integrating these abstractions into a coherent whole, poses two risks. The first risk is to become so abstract that the message loses its meaning and relevance; the second risk is to succumb to the temptation to find another meaning when in fact there may be none. Despite these concerns, several key points are apparent, all of which deal directly with the relationship between the SCC staff and member colleges. These are discussed below, followed by a derivative concept of institutional development as suggested by the evaluation findings, and some overall recommendations.

One common theme cannot be overemphasized: significant institutional development is taking place among SCC member colleges. Development activities have taken many forms, depending upon the norms, culture, and needs of individual schools. Further, the majority of development efforts are attributable, directly or indirectly, to SCC staff involvement. As the project moves into its final two years, attention to two general concerns should help strengthen its effectiveness.

The first of these is an ambiguity of function, role, and project ownership. The SCC was originally established as a group of 56 small colleges working together to promote institutional development. The project is at least technically administered by one of these schools. Most of the daily administration, however, takes place at the Washington office, where six people advise, consult with, and organize development activities for personnel in all member schools. Their activities have accounted for some remarkable results, particularly in three of the technical assistance areas.

Sometimes, however, contacts with member colleges have been short, intense, and fragmentary, leaving both parties with a sense of dissatisfaction and lack of closure: unease among some SCC staff that they're spread too thin to accomplish anything, and puzzlement among some college staff about how they may best use what the SCC has to offer. Several results obtain: a movement by some schools toward perceiving the SCC as a source of funds to use as they see fit, regarding the central office as something akin to a governmental bureaucracy; a focus by some schools on specific, concrete problems while avoiding larger systemic issues; and a lack of coordination of services at some places, or even a lack of knowledge at some schools that certain forms of technical assistance are available. None of these trends is likely to lead to large-scale institutional development; but neither are they necessarily bad signs. They simply reflect the enormous size and complexity of this project, and the importance of planning and coordinating efforts so as to best use staff and college time.

An offshoot of this functional ambiguity is an apparent confusion between means and ends which surfaces several times in both the hypothesis-free and issue-based analyses. Some of the colleges studied appeared to consider institutional development as a mandate to change something, pointing to such things as curriculum revision, computer-based management information, and the like, without anchoring such changes to a clearly defined sense of purpose or mission. As pointed out in the hypothesis-free synthesis, colleges fortunate enough to have a positive self image were more likely to engage in meaningful development activities, not simply change for change's sake. A similar phenomenon occurs at the SCC staff level, where an activity focus (workshops, advisor visits, and so forth), without opportunity for long-term, coordinated follow-through, creates a similar means/ends confusion and leads to "activity for activity's sake" operating styles. Clearly, impetus for institutional development must come from somewhere; the challenge lies in determining how best to use such activities as catalysts, while avoiding the "more effort is better" trap.

The above observations lead inductively to a reformulation of the concept of institutional development. This definition is cast as a series of stages through which both SCC staff and member colleges must move together. Clearly, since member colleges began this project with different aspirations, and SCC staff began their interactions with these colleges at widely different points, progress through these stages will vary considerably from school to school. It does appear, however, that despite these differences, institutional development in the SCC follows a consistent pattern.

The first stage is characterized by scattered, somewhat disjointed activities (e.g., focus workshops, development of college "fact books"), all based on perhaps idealized expectations and vague expressions of need. This is the stage at which the means/ends confusions referred to earlier are likely to predominate. SCC staff members tend to be used as experts, college relationships tend to be dependent ones, and a chronicle of development activities would tend to reflect a number of false starts and dead ends.

The second stage is one of realization and internalization; realization in the form of lowered expections, and internalization in the form of a better sense of what works and what doesn't work. In simplified terms, most colleges last year were working through Stage One; now many colleges appear to be working through Stage Two. All of the evidence collected in this year's evaluation points to the critical nature of this developmental stage. Here, the risk is disillusionment and frustration on all sides based upon perceived ineffectiveness of specific activities. This is the stage, therefore, at which strong, coordinated staff follow-through efforts are most needed to forestall discouragement. The advisor's role becomes critical to help college personnel sift through actions and reactions and to help reformulate goals and priorities. One of the key findings in last year's and this year's case studies was the value placed by member colleges upon SCC staff as linking pins to outside resources and as sounding boards for ideas and interpretations of data. This is the point at which staff members cannot afford to work at cross purposes.

The final stage of institutional development may be characteristized by integrated efforts and a focus on incremental effects. By "integrated efforts" is meant the systematic coordination of formerly independent or isolated activities. Development activities thus take place within a context grounded both by identifiable needs and by probable outcomes. "Incremental effects" refer to a series of small changes from the status quo. These are fostered by the realization that radical changes in a college's mission, goals, or structure are unlikely in most cases. Rather, significant progress is seen as more likely to occur as a series of small but purposeful moves. In this way a development structure slowly evolves which allows further development to occur. None of the colleges studied in this year's cases have yet reached this stage of development, but some are fast approaching it. The major challenge for the SCC in the coming year will be to help other member colleges do the same.

How, then, may SCC staff better coordinate their efforts with those of member colleges; and conversely, how may member colleges better utilize SCC resources? One way is to reaffirm the principles under which this project began, namely, that institutional development as just described and the linkages among the SCC and member colleges which facilitate that development are under the control of the college. College staff have both the right and the responsibility to ask hard questions about what the SCC has to offer them. Core staff must eventually play a facilitating, not overseeing, role if long-range development is to occur. Dependent relationships tend to foster dependence. Member colleges who are able to scrutinize available SCC resources in light of clearly defined indigenous needs stand the greatest chance of long-term project impact.

By the same token, SCC staff have both the right and the responsibility to ask hard questions about institutional characteristics as defined in the case studies before suggesting specific courses of action. Strategies which work in one college may not work in another; personal and professional relationships which work in one college may not work in another. The spirit of the growth plan should be based rather on the mutual accountability of one side to the other, not on an organization in which member colleges report once a year. As noted in the recommendations from the issue-focused analysis (Section III), accomplishment of mutual accountability may require some reorganization of the SCC central office so that they might better model the sort of comprehensive, integrated, holistic approach to development sought in the member schools. Further, as noted in the hypothesis-free case studies, accomplishment of mutual accountability from the colleges' perspective may require some analysis of how they use SCC (and other) consultants, particularly with respect to how such consultations both relate to, and facilitate progress toward, institutional goals. Early on in this project, many if not most of the member schools were unable to take such a definitive, independent stance. Now these colleges have both the need and the opportunity to use the SCC as a collaborator for healthy, constructive change.

Appendix 1: Eight Case Studies

COLLEGE A: A Small Evangelical Christian Liberal Arts College

The Environment

College A is a coeducational, non-denominational, evangelical Christian liberal arts college located in a small town in the northcentral Midwest. It shows a nationwide enrollment distribution, but as of 1973 more than 80% of its 772 students came from within the state in which it is located. It was fully accredited as a four year college in 1967, although its institutional history reaches back to the 1870's and includes operation as a high school and later a junior college.

The concept around which the college functions calls for an academic community marked by serious involvement in the liberal arts, total commitment to Jesus Christ as a perspective for learning, and critical participation in the contemporary world. The college's ultimate goal is the participation of intelligent and socially responsible graduates in the affairs of life.

With respect to the Small College Consortium (SCC), College A appears to have been the recipient of a high frequency of SCC contact as well as the site of high levels of campus-based activity.

College A's campus is a pastiche of architectural genres. The newer buildings figure its growth and history as the older ones exhibit its background in times when it contained a high school. The surrounding land is rural and agricultural. Small farms border the college acres, and the low rolling hills stand very green in an early spring. The campus is a site of visual contrasts: the large, low-slung former high school building and the red brick academic hall; the small brick two-story house (that is the seat of the Speech and Drama Departments as well as the On-Campus Coordinator (OCC) whose office is in the cellar), and the large, square building that is the new gymnasium and athletic center.

The people are characteristically friendly. They say hello to each other. Walking around the small campus is a thoroughly pleasant experience even on a chilly afternoon in early spring.

The students seem bright-eyed, friendly, and responsive, at least to visitors. There seems to be a sense of community at College A that is symbolized by "The Blue and Gold Sheet," a list of announcements for students and staff that is prepared daily and is widely visible around campus.

Standing in the portico of the library, I heard one student say to a companion, "Wait a minute, I want to read the 'Blue and Gold'." The diversity and sense of community on the campus is suggested by the range of events and invitations listed in "The Blue and Gold Sheet." Consider for example, "MUSIC MAJORS--All music majors who did not do a jury first semester must do one this semester. Sign up for a time upstairs in Post

House, in Jody's office." On the other hand, in the same day's bulletin the following, "ATTENTION COLLEGE LADIES! You are . . . invited to a going away party and bridal shower . . . in the private dining room of the Dining Commons. Come when you can and leave when you must." The shower was for a member of the cafeteria staff.

The OCC

The OCC's cellar office also appears to help people get together. A modest renovation brought the faculty lounge into a small space that is adjacent to the OCC's quarters. Morning coffee and donuts appear to be available daily. At least a dozen different faculty (out of 45-50), including the Academic Dean, made use of the small room during a one-day period of observation. Small samples of faculty who were informally interviewed in these circumstances appeared to have positive attitudes toward the SCC effort, although it seems that their personal knowledge of the SCC is directly related to their personal involvement or their relationships with the On-Campus Coordinator.

Part poet, part scholar, part philosopher and fully a family person, the OCC is reminiscent of Orson Welles' characterization of Citizen Kane--or possibly a latter-day Falstaff--depending on how you read. Bright, witty, strong-voiced, the OCC exudes enthusiasm. "He has ideas; he follows through; he gets things rolling, and then he gets things done." "He articulates well." When he took on the position as On-Campus Coordinator, he thought that the effort might help him achieve some of his personal and professional goals, but two years later the vision has changed somewhat to the picture of a person who gets things going, and then may try to be a bit more passive and low-profiled. He sees his future at the college holding more involvement with focused academic issues.

The OCC presents an important contrast to College A's President of 12 years. An experienced leader and administrator in the Christian college community, the President is characterized as a "careful, pragmatic person." He has guided the college through a period of growth, balanced budgets, and national reputation as a college fully invested in the concept of student development. The President, who is approaching retirement, uses "rural terminology" and is seen by some as an "intuitive leader." He is "down to earth," and, as another staff person said, "He'll change the system in every way to meet individual needs."

Every spring just prior to graduation, the President holds personal interviews with all graduating seniors who are accessible. During these conversations, he reports, he quietly reviews students' perceptions of the college, its strengths and weaknesses, and is open to suggestions. Like the President, College A collects a lot of data; some people, however, appear to be unsure of what happens to it.

Activities and Concerns

Given strong positive input from the SCC, the college mounted a major effort in long-range planning that challenged and involved a broad number of faculty, already pressed by other responsibilities, in a careful process of information collection, assessment, invention, and planning. To the chagrin of some faculty, the outcomes of that effort appear to have halted, at least for the present. Plans seem to have been put aside and the process abrogated. Waxing philosophical, the OCC explains the change from widespread involvement and public disclosure to a more centralized, closed style by observing, "Maybe the formal planning model is in conflict with a small community such as ours." Indeed, a careful analysis of the concept around which the college is structured and the principal underpinnings of the rational, data-based planning model may uncover important questions, if not contradictions. At College A the planning model is still built around the President and thoroughly depends on his commitment to it. In an obvious response to an uncompromising reality, long-range planning appears to have, for the moment, taken a back seat to the more immediate concerns of budget and salaries.

College A is clearly a maturing institution that is currently trying to solidify the dramatic transition it made from a junior college to a four-year school 13 years ago. As one student said, for the last several semesters, College A may have been "maintaining" rather than forcefully moving on in one direction or another. Then again, the atmosphere at the college appears naturally casual and comfortable. Faculty seemed to have had some dissatisfaction with the state of things about a year and a half ago, but the picture has improved recently. Morale is up.

One of the factors that may be related to College A's experience during the next several years will more than likely be the way it responds to the press from several faculty and some administrators for an increase in the professional, work-related aspects of the traditional liberal arts curriculum. Operating as the only accredited senior level institution in a county of more than 156,000 residents, College A's capacity to identify and respond to the needs and futures of that community appears to be a topic of current discussion and importance. In the spirit of the community ministry programs, College A seems to have a built-in rationale for responding to the community needs that surround it.

One of the issues that currently captures some of the campus is the extent to which the college will be able to be responsive to this potential future and, at the same time, protect and maintain its sense of commitment to the values of its faith and the liberal arts tradition. There is a strong sense of academic integrity that grips the faculty, and it appears to be the faculty who will ultimately be asked to decide on this issue, although exactly how that involvement will occur is not altogether clear.

As the search for a new President unfolds, College A will probably have to deliberate openly about the relative emphasis its next President should place on the academic program and curriculum, a decision that the Board of Trustees is agreed by all to have a strong hand in. Up to this point, the President, the Academic Dean, and the Board seem to have left curricular matters essentially to the faculty.

The activities of the SCC in both workshop support and consultation are assisting the college with this and several related concerns (e.g., long-range planning). Faculty and administrators tend to be positive toward the people at the SCC. The response is typically to the people and less to the organization. The sense of person that imbues many at College A also touches the metaphors that portray the activities of the Consortium: "Really good people." They know how to help without being pushy." The off-campus retreat allowed us to get the faculty together, including their families."

The chairman of the faculty development effort would support the notion that off-campus activities are more effective for College A's faculty than are on-site workshops. On-campus workshops on time management and "fellowship" (values clarification) were seen as effective by the coordinator of faculty development, but it is also the case that some three thousand dollars earmarked to support individual faculty efforts has generally gone unused, and possibly unasked for.

This phenomenon seems to appear again in the response to one of the off-campus workshops on the use of radio in course design. After generating considerable enthusiasm and apparently achieving some good preliminary designs and outlines, return of the work groups to campus showed little or no effective follow-up or overt support for the efforts. Consequently, there appears to have been little, if any, continued work on these radio-based courses.

College A is a high quality institution that--in the words of the OCC--is "casual in the bone." His "unqualified support for the SCC--super people" underlines the Consortium's help in his own personal growth, in increasing the range of contacts between College A and other people and institutions (thus diminishing a lingering feeling of isolation), in bringing together some Protestant and Catholic schools, and lastly, for providing "objective, factual information for administrators to make better decisions."

College A's future appears to be a bright one. It seems to be moving out of the period of "maintaining" and into a time of important deliberation and policy formation. Selection of a new President during the next several years should prove to be an important decision point that will focus many of the themes described above.

COLLEGE B: A Small Catholic Women's College

Background

College B is a Catholic women's college located in a small midwestern city. Its cluster of red brick buildings on a hilltop overlooking a river valley give the visitor an impression of solid tradition as he winds his way up to the campus. It is quite a small college with an FTE student population of just under 600 and an FTE faculty staff of 39. The on-campus student population of approximately 500 is composed primarily of young women who attend college directly out of high school. About 12% are minority students. Overall student enrollment suffered a precipitous drop in 1973, but has risen steadily since then, and levelled off in 1977. Over the years incoming students have reported two major reasons behind their selection of the college: a "good academic reputation" and the "availability of financial assistance." Three out of four faculty members are sisters, although this proportion has been declining steadily during the past several years.

The college has seventeen academic departments, a surprisingly large number for a small school. All of these departments except education, home economics, business, and physical education are in the liberal arts area. The most popular major is education (selected by about 30% of the students), followed by business and English. The OCC noted that "there are no programs for which (the college) is unique." "It has not had much luck" in night courses, and its general focus is upon programs for on-campus students. The college does carry on a substantial cooperative effort with two local prisons (in which a number of faculty members teach), and with a local community college via a "2 plus 2" arrangement. Both students and faculty members point to the college's "strong academic reputation," Its full accreditation was renewed last year, faculty members seem genuinely satisfied with the academic caliber of the student body, and students themselves report that in general students take their work very seriously. Such values are nurtured by a very close-knit academic atmosphere, a sense of seclusion, and living arrangements which are shared with faculty members. Finally, despite its apparent physical isolation, students report that the "cultural aspects" of the college are quite favorable, with an ample number of speakers, lectures, and concerts. Lack of student opportunities for socializing is a much talked about issue, however.

The college appears to be in good shape financially. It is essentially debt free, and its budget has been kept in the black for the past several years, a fact which most observers attribute to outside support via an annual fund drive and to contributed services from the sisters. These conclusions have been supported by external consultants who characterize the college's budget as a "sustaining" budget. Contributed services are gradually decreasing, however, as fewer and fewer women enter the Order, and this trend is a source of concern to top administrative officers who worry about its probable effects upon the "character and mission" of the college.

The organizational and administrative character of the college may best be characterized as "participatory." Many institutions may tout participatory governance, but here such principles are tightly embedded in the decision-making fabric. The Board of Trustees is composed of elected sisters, most of whom reside on campus, and enjoys substantial respect for its vigorous, forward-looking involvement. All major policy decisions are made by the full faculty; the President, who is held in high regard as an "inspirational" leader, resists a "top-down" management style, and prefers that faculty "own" decisions through consensus. (As will be noted later, such a management style has clear strengths and limitations for this college, particularly as it relates to institutional development efforts.) As a result, there appears to be an unusually high level of trust between administration and faculty. Further, top administrative roles complement one another remarkably well: the President, an open, inspirational leader with strong ties to the community; the Academic Dean, task-oriented, fair and accessible; the Dean of Students, people-centered and process-oriented; the Director of Institutional Research, a sister with more than 20 years of administrative experience at the college and who takes a solid, long-range perspective.

History of Development Efforts

Institutional development has a long and active history at this college, due principally to a close relationship between the President and a nearby regional council for higher education. The most recent pre-SCC development activity was a major restructuring of the curriculum. After "three years of struggle to iron out bugs and remove ambiguities," courses are now designed to relate to certain institutional goals, and students design their educational experiences around "individual learning plans." A key element is the apparent faculty acceptance of these changes; there are disagreements as to whether the new curriculum will be significantly better than the old one, but still the changes are pointed to with pride as changes. Faculty wonder at how they can all come together on such things.

A close involvement with the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) led quite naturally into involvement with SCC, and was reinforced by the President's long-standing desire to make use of Title III funds. The college originally planned for four project areas - recruitment, long-range planning, fiscal development, and academic development - for which the need has been substantiated by "numerous consultants." The latter area was dropped due to the recent curriculum changes. The decision was made to spend one year focusing on each of the other three areas, beginning with recruitment (an "immediate need" due to the levelling of admissions), followed by long-range planning ("an umbrella"), then finishing the project with fiscal development.

Project Activities To Date

Recruitment. Prior to project involvement, recruitment and admissions took place in two separate offices; from all accounts, the respective directors of these offices did not coordinate their efforts. "Objective outsiders" had recommended combining these offices before, but in the words of the Dean, "the attention of the whole campus plus the enthusiasm of the

OCC cracked the problem," and the combination was accomplished. The OCC became so enthusiastic, in fact, that she eventually agreed to take over the administration of the new office. Interestingly, while this whole process was seen as traumatic, it was not perceived as a "power play" on the OCC's part, and she has continued in that role this year.

Long-range planning. A new OCC took over last summer to direct planning efforts. Project goals were unquestionably ambitious: three task forces, together encompassing virtually the entire faculty (along with staff and student representatives), were assigned to, respectively, study the data base, come up with strategies for development, and formulate implementation plans. Team leaders were selected by the OCC upon the advice of the administrative team. Faculty members then self-selected into groups of interest, and most were able to get their first choice. Planning meetings for the process were held in the summer, managed by consultants from a nearby regional council for higher education, and work began in earnest in August. In addition, a group of architects was hired to do a space utilization study.

True to their style, administrators did not choose to include themselves on the planning teams; in the words of one administrator, they did not want the "heavy hand of administration" getting in the way of creative thinking and full ownership of the process by faculty members. Administrators did volunteer to assist task forces whenever needed; to their chagrin, however, by March none of the groups had yet approached them.

The OCC is disappointed with the progress made on the plan this year. The "lock-step model" (her term) required that certain progress be made by each group before the next one could really get underway, and the first team became bogged down early. Several things happened to slow things up. First, the planning model itself was quite complicated, and took longer than expected to develop; consequently, while most faculty were impressed with the model's sophistication, many felt overwhelmed by it. Second, the head of the first task team resigned early on due to unexpected commitments elsewhere, requiring the OCC to fill in until a replacement was found. Third, because of the OCC's teaching load, she was less involved in the process than she felt she needed to be. Fourth, the team "got lost in data" and had problems pulling it all together. As noted previously, the administration had offered its services in this regard, but committee members "didn't know what questions to ask." Fifth, the study of physical facilities contained some controversial recommendations, and there was apparently considerable debate among the faculty as to what to do with them. All of these problems together resulted in a sense of "stuckness" (as the OCC called it) and a feeling of isolation among task force members. Another more subtle factor was perhaps partly responsible, namely, a feeling by some that the college has survived very well without a long-range plan - that the administration could make the right decisions as need arose.

In early Spring one of the team coordinators approached the OCC with her frustrations, and found that the OCC had already made an appointment with the President to discuss the problem. Several actions were taken as a result of this meeting, including a lowering of task group assignments and scheduling an all-day conference for late April to pull the data together. These decisions were clearly a source of relief for all concerned;

as of our visit, the Saturday meeting was about a week away, and people were expecting a "magical moment" that would steer the planning process back on track.*

A large-scale commitment to long-range planning remains among the faculty, despite these problems. First, a strong feeling persists that greater consensus and articulation of mission and goals is needed before more aggressive fund-raising can occur. Second, most faculty appear sold on the planning model, despite its complexity, and are not terribly concerned about its lack of adherence to the original schedule. As one faculty member noted, "Calendar deadlines will get things moving." Third, there is a great deal of trust and respect for the OCC and the entire administrative team -- including faith that they will be able to see the project through.

Role of the SCC

The college has had only weak ties to the Consortium this year. This is due principally to the availability of local consultants who were heavily involved with the development of the planning model, and who were close enough to follow up on campus from time to time. There is some evidence that at times these consultants and SCC staff worked at cross purposes; the OCC attended a workshop on planning, but found she was unable to implement ideas she gained there due to "prior commitments" with the local consultant's approach. A technical assistance visit by an SCC staff member was not received particularly well, as his remarks were "too general" to be useful. (One might conclude that his remarks were "general" simply because he didn't want to contradict the approach currently being followed. SCC credibility clearly suffered as a result, however.) Administrators particularly showed irritation with the SCC over their failure to warn them of possible problems with the plan; as the President indicated, "We need an outside monitor of the whole process." Another popular view was voiced by the Academic Dean, who said, "We've had too many consultants from too many places. Their approaches are all different and this leads to conflicts." If the college were forced to choose, most would probably select local people as consultants -- they are seen as "more accessible," their expertise is "more relevant," and there is some distrust of the bureaucracy a Washington-based project represents.

The SCC has had some favorable impacts, nonetheless. The OCC noted the "valuable ideas" she gained from other OCCs at their January meeting; a visit by their SCC advisor helped facilitate "getting things unstuck" by clarifying the difference between "organizational planning and long-range planning" and encouraging the OCC to ask the President for help; project-generated funds supported the facilities study; and consultation on fiscal matters was seen as important and particularly useful for their work next year. In sum, while most agreed that consultants had not been used especially well this year, much of the responsibility must rest with people at the college for not knowing how to use them. As one administrator expressed it, "While an external nudge may be of value for initiation and attention-getting, a one-day shot has limited effectiveness. We need a longer exposure." The President herself foresees a more active role for the SCC in terms of helping to "flesh out" the long-range plan and to assist the college in its evaluation of long-range fiscal stability of the College, an item to be considered next year as part of the College's focus on fiscal development.

---

*It is too early to tell whether such a "magical moment" in fact occurred. The Saturday meeting was organized in a manner faithful to the "participatory" model: small groups of faculty, administrators, and staff each considered the ramifications of all the data generated to date, and came up with a large number of interpretive statements. How these in turn will be combined into a meaningful document remains to be seen.

Future Prospects

The prospects for institutional development at this college, and for the most effective role the SCC may play in that development, are best considered in light of perceived college strengths and issues. These are noted below, as are implications for development which obtain from these perceptions.

Strengths. Perhaps the most striking positive characteristic about this college is the administration's belief in and practice of participatory decision-making. This theme was echoed over and over, as respondents pointed with pride to high levels of trust among all organizational levels (including students and lay faculty), a strong sense of community, respect for the academic excellence of faculty and programs, and dedication to teaching and developing students. The high regard with which faculty members hold the administrative team -- almost without exception -- is remarkable. Another strength is the awareness of and commitment to long-range planning. People were quick to point out how open the college has been to change in the past and how it has done so without threatening the college's own stability or identity. Even the most conservative respondent -- one who was unhappy with recent curriculum changes -- noted that the college needs to "periodically provide a different perspective" to avoid becoming stale. Third, faith in the college's future appears boundless. As the Director of Development said, "A lot of people here believe in (the college), maybe even more than they believe in themselves." This faith applies as well to lay faculty, who teach there under considerable financial sacrifice in many cases. And fourth, there do not seem to be any major inflammatory issues or critical future conflicts on campus. Due to the shared faith in the college's future, most expect that problems will somehow be worked out.

Barriers. Many of the strengths listed above also pose problems, some of them serious. First, the participatory model, while trust-producing, also produces slow decision-making -- a source of frustration to faculty and administrators alike. In particular, while faculty members desire and appreciate the involvement, they are often unsure how to handle it -- a situation that is exacerbated by a sense that the President "could do this better than we can," and a discomfort in dealing with large amounts of data. Thus, while the administration looks to faculty groups for action, faculty members look to the administrators for guidance. The expectations of both groups have been disappointed in the past. A related problem is that despite the "camaraderie" on campus, little cross-disciplinary sharing is going on: faculty are older, "locked in" to small departments, and concentrate on their own problems. As one faculty member put it, "We lack structure for mutual intellectual development." Third, one of the campus catchwords is "social climate," or lack thereof. There is great concern about the lack of physical facilities for socializing, and policies covering male visitation have been a chronic issue over the years. Underlying faculty concern about this issue is fear of losing students. A fourth problem area relates to this fear, and that is a growing sense of need for better articulation of the college's mission. Faculty members in general seek to maintain the tradition of a liberal arts college for women, but doubts creep in here and there which threaten that sense of purpose. First, the attrition rate is fairly high: second, the number of sisters entering the order has dropped precipitously; third, subtle conflicts were exposed during planning sessions over "what it means to be a Catholic college" (students and alumnae perceived too much religious emphasis). No basic agreement exists as yet on how the college may best market itself; the development office is selling the concept of a woman's college, while admissions is selling "cheap education." Finally, as the Director of Development noted, the resources available to the college "may be less than most people realize." Such a realization has only begun this year, and considering next year's focus on fiscal development, it is likely to be of much more critical concern.

Implications for the SCC seem fairly clear. This college's experience with long-range planning illustrates what can happen when "involvement" strategies are mixed with consultant input from several different sources; the result was often confusion, "stuckness," and frustration on all sides. The problem for the SCC staff in this case lay principally in defining roles for themselves. The data here suggest that once the college has made a commitment to a particular planning structure, "process" consultation is more useful than "technical" consultation.

COLLEGE C: An Evangelical Liberal Arts College In An Affluent Suburb

Background

College C was originally founded by a noted evangelist in 1938. After two moves, in 1955 it was established in a large resort hotel that had been built around the turn of the century. Its 81 acres are in the heart of an affluent county which contains 14 other colleges or universities. An evangelical, coeducational liberal arts college which is not supported by any denomination, it has enjoyed a steady growth throughout its history. From 276 students in 1955 it grew to 649 students by 1965 and has a current enrollment of close to 850, with another expected increase for 1978-79.

Growth has also occurred in its physical plant. While the campus is dominated by the lovely old Tudor hotel building, a $1 million outdoor athletic complex was completed and a new academic/science building started this year. More than ten denominations are represented in the student body with the largest group being Baptist; 90% of the students live on campus; 75% come from the local three-state area; and of some 19 majors, the largest enrollment is in business administration and economics, followed by physical and elementary education. The student-faculty ratio has risen from 14.1:1 in 1972 to 16.0:1 in 1976. With a FTE faculty of 50, some 45 are full-time.

The President, who has been with the school since 1962, is widely known for his radio ministry, and his daily programs are carried by 50 stations throughout the nation. No one doubts that he is a key element in the success of the college. His radio ministry raises funds and recruits students, his business sense maintains a balanced budget, his Christian faith sets both the tone and the direction for the campus. Some speak of the religious support he has given to their lives, a few find him to have a dominating personality, but all are loyal to his administration.

The college is perceived by some to be somewhat conservative (with reference to student conduct standards) but many identify their school with other evangelical liberal arts colleges which are leaders in higher education. The faculty has developed a philosophy of education and goals for the student which are taken quite seriously as references for curriculum development and student growth. The essential guiding concept of the educational program is that of the integration of faith and learning.

The school has had a long and close association with CASC. They participated in a variety of their early cost studies, were part of their faculty development project and send a team to the CASC National Institute each year. Membership in the SCC was seen as a natural extension of these past efforts. Their first year's focus in Institutional Development was upon technical assistance area I (Planning, Management and Evaluation) and area II (Enrollment Development). During that period the budgetary process was "opened up" with greater input from division chairmen, computerized student record and admission inquiry systems were installed, a Factbook completed, the NCHEMS studies went through "1½ times," and several admissions studies were completed. The second year has continued to focus upon these two areas, but "Resource Development" had top priority. Activities included: completion of the Admissions Market Study, analysis of the AID advising program, consultant services provided for the new Directors of Development and Student Financial Aid, completion of another round of the NCHEMS study, documentation of the Student Information System and exploration of more effective ways to relate their activities to their institutional goals.

The OCC came to College C in 1972 to help establish programs in physics and pre-med. In 1975, he became Registrar and Director of Institutional Research. His function as OCC is associated with the Institutional Research role. He sees himself as a ". . . numbers man who is a bit uneasy with stagnant situations. I like to see things change and grow." He is past chairman of their CASC faculty development team and has been involved with a variety of committees which have worked to modify social and academic policies. He feels their early involvement with faculty development as important for it "opened us up to other schools and gave us the feeling of being less isolated. But of greater importance, we gained more self-confidence when we saw what we were doing in relation to others."

He looks back at the first year of the SCC project with a sense of satisfaction. "We concentrated on data gathering and analysis. I did all of the work and had control over the product." This second year has been a bit more frustrating. "I am now trying to work with other departments and encourage development in their offices. It is difficult in situations where others see little need for change. For example, the Admissions Director says: 'We already are giving you too many students - why should we change our office?'--and who can argue with success?" As a result, the OCC pokes, pushes, and suggests. "I arrange for consultants to come to the campus. But it is a different ball game. We already have success on campus--we are now looking for incremental gains."

The Vice President for Academic Affairs agrees that change can be slow. However, through careful planning and hard work, a good number of positive changes have occurred in recent years. "I had to go back to the Board of Trustees three different times before I could get money allocated for our month-long faculty workshop on faith and learning." This workshop, in its second year, has already had an extremely positive impact on campus. Even the President, who is perceived by all as a "strong leader," feels that he has to operate "quietly but gradually. One has to drop a seed and wait for it to grow. When we first started this school I had to begin below the floor and deal with preventive maintenance. Now that we have the hardware in place, we can put greater emphasis upon a quality education."

Some Recent Developments

While change appears to be slow to some, the OCC is able to cite a wide variety of changes in the past five years. This list includes: implementation of the faculty workshop on the integration of faith and learning, modifications in the standard of conduct (students and faculty may now view "certain of the performing arts ... (in light of their) educational and cultural values"); modification of the core curriculum (interdisciplinary courses, more flexibility and reduction from 64 to 53 credits out of a total of 130); changes in house rules (e.g., later hours, revised dress regulations); committee restructuring (to include students); improvements in promotional literature, catalog, and application procedures; availability of an academic minor (to allow for wider career flexibility); new majors in sociology and medical technology; creation of lounges for the faculty as well as students and "rolling tenure" (five-year contracts for those who had tenure and agreed to the change). As a result of these changes, he feels that there is a more positive attitude on campus than there was three or four years ago.

One possible sign of past negative feelings was that the college's score on an Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) taken four years ago was off the chart on several categories dealing with morale. The Vice President for Academic Affairs believes "Things go in cycles. Feelings have changed since that IFI. Morale is much better now." It is interesting to note that the IFI profile was very close to that of the college's two chief competitors among Christian liberal arts colleges. A group of faculty at lunch seemed to agree with the statement that "morale is higher." They attributed the improvement to the growing enrollment and the younger faculty's response to rolling tenure. The President says, "The faculty was scared when I first got here. There was a tendency for heads to be chopped regularly. With the increase in faculty involvement many - but not all - feel much more secure."

One example of involvement and the rate of change might be seen in the case of the student lounge. Because of high enrollments and extremely crowded facilities, students had been complaining for years that they had no place to "relax and get together." Last year a large classroom was renovated at a major expense to free up a handsome room (with a large fireplace) which was refurnished as a student lounge. Later, the student government chose to equip this space with "electronic games" (pin ball machines). When several members of the community expressed some "concern" about these games, the student government decided to poll the students at chapel to get their opinions. Their written poll showed that 29% "didn't care," 29% "were offended" and 43% felt the machines were "good." The machines were removed. The student President states, "We have to proceed step by step and be responsive to the opinions of the minority. We saw what was not acceptable this year - maybe things will change next."

There is one overriding issue which does not seem to have changed, and that deals with housing. While the average faculty salary has increased from $10,560 in 1972 to $12,886 in 1976, most faculty cannot afford local housing. As a result, nearly 40% of the faculty have another job, many wives work, some drive over two hours to work. The Vice President for Academic Affairs reports, "It is not hard to make initial contacts with prospective faculty. Many are excited about our academic program, but it becomes very difficult when we talk about housing."

The OCC believes that the housing problem may help explain why people work in isolation from each other. "There is a tendency to let others do their own thing. While there is great commitment to the college, everyone feels so overextended that they have very little left when it comes to input into decision-making." He continues, "Another strange thing is people keep telling me: 'You are wasting your time getting involved. You'd better watch out' - and yet I feel that I have support from the administration for promoting change." He also feels that the housing situation could explain why the faculty are too busy to request small funds for faculty development.

Relations with the SCC

Four different members of the SCC staff have visited the campus during the past two years. Reactions to these visits are positive. One administrator believes, "Their visits gave our folks the feeling that we had friends on the outside." The President is "happy with the SCC. They get people aware of where they should be heading. There is some tendency to be theoretical, but they vaccinate people with concepts and that is helpful." The OCC feels that they might have used their consultants better this year. "We bring people here but they only can go so far. We need more follow-through. I have talked to the SCC staff about developing a real delivery package next year - one in which they will help us monitor our progress and stop us from drifting. This could improve our effectiveness."

Members of the administration have also attended a variety of SCC workshops. The Dean of Students states, "I'm enthusiastic about SCC's contribution to our freshman advising program. The content of the workshop was good, the staff enthusiastic and interesting. I received some good resource materials." The Director of Development reports, "The Detroit workshop was immensely important for me, since this is my first year on the job."

The OCC believes their contact with the SCC staff was "fairly high" and that their campus activity was "moderately active." While all of the second year objectives were not fully realized, he feels that the Admissions Market Study will have some real payoffs and that the new Director of Development has "received a great deal of help." He is pleased with the new student information system and sees some progress toward long-range planning due to the opening up of the budgetary process. But he also feels that it is difficult to document their progress "because we have no impending crisis or perceived immediate problems."

The Future

College C faces a series of paradoxes. The College has experienced annual growth in its student body, *and yet* many colleges are facing declining enrollments. Students describe the faculty as "caring," "qualified," "knowledgeable" and "easy to talk to" *and yet* funds for faculty development go unspent. The school prides itself on its retention rate and interpersonal relationships *and yet* members of the Student Development staff see themselves as "second class citizens." The President had noted that he is 65 years old - the Board has appointed a search committeee for his replacement *and yet* few on campus seem to have had opportunity to express an opinion on his replacement. The OCC (and others) feel that they can (and indeed do) obtain change *and yet* many believe you can get in trouble by becoming involved. The school has a clear record of success (balanced budgets, new facilities, growing enrollment) *and yet* there are national forecasts of declining enrollments.

The school has come a long way in the past 17 years. The creative tensions produced by such paradoxes as these have served to strengthen the institution. Their future seems to depend upon their ability to continue to deal with these issues within the context of inflation and a declining student market.

COLLEGE D: An Organization Faces Maturity

Background

College D is a coeducational, Catholic college located seven miles from a city of 45,000 in the North Central plains. In 1967 only grass grew on the prominent bluff overlooking the Missouri River. Today the bluff supports striking modern buildings which divide into two campuses. The south campus is the education wing of the Priory complex, the Sisters' residence of the sponsoring body. This complex also includes the chapel and library, and residential housing for women students. The main campus is separated from these buildings by a small hill; its 4 sprawling concrete buildings appear to have been designed for protection against the severe winters and hot summers. The main campus classroom and residence buildings were completed in 1968, the Activity Center in 1973, the Nursing Center in 1976, and a complex of student apartments in 1977.

The college was originally established in 1955 by the supporting religious order as a junior college. It became a four-year college in 1959 with an initial emphasis on teaching and nursing. Full accreditation was granted in 1969. Today the college offers degrees in seven divisions with twenty-two major fields as well as two associate degrees. Student enrollment has grown from 160 in the early years to over 900 today, with one third of the student body being residential. Most students come from within a 200-mile radius which is predominately rural. It is the only Catholic college and one of the two private colleges in the state. A two-year community college in the nearby city is a supplier of transfer students. While 40% of a recent freshman class graduated four years after matriculation, the current senior class is nearly as large as the freshman class. Members of the staff perceive their school as "a professional college with a strong liberal arts base." They are proud of their emphasis upon the "average student" as well as their special programs which include a minor in Native American Studies for American Indian students. One administrator notes, "You can almost feel the growth of students as they come from their rural backgrounds and are exposed to new ideas."

During the last four months the school has announced the following changes:

- A new 4-4-1 (from a 4-1-4) calendar which will allow students to take courses in May in order to either increase their "specialization in preparation for careers" or "pursue the liberal arts - including the possibility of travel here or abroad."

- A new "Alternate Education Program" which will give college credit for prior learning and allow students to take not only regular course offerings but also "continuing education courses, summer courses, plus independent study courses."

- The receipt of a two-year $100,000 grant to revitalize the liberal arts by reviewing the entire curriculum to better prepare students for "responsible leadership."

- A new form of leadership referred to as "dual leadership" by which the current President was appointed Chairman of the Board and will be responsible for "external matters including all aspects of resource development, budget preparation, public relations, and admissions." A new President will be responsible for "internal affairs including student development, academic affairs and financial affairs."

The People

This college, like most small organizations, is shaped by people who play a variety of roles in its existence. The following five sketches are meant to provide an understanding of some people new at this school.

The President does not fit the stereotype of a college president. Seldom with a tie (or without a cigar), his office door never seems to be closed. People wander into his office when they think it is important. He prefers this informal approach. He tells of his own personal as well as financial security that comes from several successful years as a stockbroker. He also remembers his first year as President and overcoming a $150,000 deficit from the previous year. "We started with limited financial resources and you couldn't afford to make mistakes. I was hired to administer, and I had to have complete control over the budget." There is universal respect for his keeping the school "in the black" but some question if his concern for the budget isn't at the expense of effective programs. Some describe his management style as a "benevolent dictator." He takes pride in his openness and close relationships with most of the staff. However he feels, "There is a problem with being too open and friendly. I try to maintain the personal closeness and still recognize that people have different abilities." One faculty member reports that, "Harry is like a turtle - hard on the outside, soft on the inside."

The V.P. for Financial Affairs first came to the college in 1971 as head of the accounting department. He resigned in 1972 to work for a small company which was experiencing "fantastic growth." He came back to the college in 1974: "I missed being involved in higher education. I also saw that the company was going to be taken over by a conglomerate and the excitement of big growth was about over." He feels his background in teaching has been important. "It taught me that you can't get things done without taking human feelings into consideration. We can't have change unless people are willing to share their disagreements." This past year he has been meeting with the divisions to go over their budgets and "answer their questions." He is not interested in developing new procedures from scratch for handling information: "We don't have the time for that. I prefer to see things that already work and talk with people who have had practical experience."

The OCC came to the college six years ago as a secretary. A year ago she became the administrative assistant for the V.P. for Academic Affairs. She identified with the concern others expressed about the morale of the supporting staff and their high turnover rate. She feels "a great deal of excitement and spirit here," but, "I don't feel I've been a decisive factor in decision-making for Small College Consortium activity."

The current Director of Deferred Giving and Church Relations reports she had been *the* music department. She attempts to raise funds by stressing that this is the only Catholic school in the state and the region has a responsibility to produce "Christian leaders." She feels that they try to be "person-centered with the focus upon the person within the community" and that this type of education is an extension of her religious order's stress upon meeting community needs. She sees the school as having gone from "fiscal distress to solidarity" and their next stage is to construct a "structure for stability." Among the challenges facing the school is "a need to better clarify values within our different communities - the religious order, the school and the local community - so that they can all work together for social justice." She also sees a need to develop "academic quality" and feels this will require a review of faculty and administrative evaluation.

A faculty member who is perceived as "a member of the loyal opposition" is deeply concerned about the decision-making process. "Our committees don't work because 'they' have already made the important decisions...all too often we are told *what* to do without being told *why*." He sees new programs being started with a lot of fanfare but then dwindling due to a lack of follow-through. "If only the administration were more sensitive and would say 'thank you' occasionally." He sees "unanimous acceptance" for the new dual leadership and is in favor of a more "systematic" organizational setup. He feels the faculty is gaining in power "but our problem is that we don't know how much power we should have." He concludes, "You know, it's strange. Sometimes I go home at night and am so angry at this place...and yet I wouldn't trade jobs for anything. I came here at a cut in salary, and it is just great because no matter how much I complain, we still get tremendous things accomplished here."

Relationship to the SCC

Few people on campus can distinguish between the SCC and the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC), and most see this as "a CASC project." Two administrators attended the three-day Kansas City MIS workshop in 1977, and their advisor has made an annual visit to campus. One administrator found the MIS workshop "Valuable. We didn't really expect to be able to establish a full-fledged MIS by the end of the workshop. Rather we wanted to see what other schools were doing and get a better idea of what systems seemed to work best." The advisor visits, while not expected to have a direct impact upon the campus were seen as "helpful." Indeed the President found the second year's visit to be "outstanding." Some feel that suggestions made by the SCC staff will directly affect their marketing plan for admissions and even shape their MIS. When asked about the small number of contacts with the SCC, the President stated, "We didn't turn anybody down. We took what was offered to us." He continued, "I don't agree that Title III consortia should be limited to 10 or 12 members. We wanted college-to-college linkages and these must extend beyond our region. Having only small regional campus groups is not enough because (1) you get the same ideas, and (2) we are in competition."

The OCC assumed her position several days before the 1977 August OCC workshop. "I really had little idea what to expect." She reports that she has found the staff "helpful" but is disappointed that the written report promised after their advisor's visit (of 2 months ago) has yet to be received. While she sees the school's direct involvement with the SCC staff as "very low relative to other schools," she thinks their activities under the grant have been "medium to high," with a definite impact upon the Alternate Education Program and by raising the professional level of the public affairs staff.

During the past year the OCC has spent the majority of her time as the Administrative Assistant to the Council which oversees their new Alternate Education Program. She has assisted with the design, publicity, and administration of a six-hour seminar orientation series which has been completed by two groups of adult students. Through the project a variety of on-campus consultants (primarily for the Office of Public Affairs) and funds have been provided so that others may attend workshops in a variety of subjects including "Alumni Administration," "Assessment of Prior Learning," "Fund Raising" and the SCC-CASC workshop on "Administrative Management."

The Future

One person labeled this college "an instant organization," and while most see their institutional youth as giving them "aggressiveness and flexibility," their growing maturity is also presenting them with several new problems. The first concerns decision-making. Centralized decision-making was seen as a necessity when they were young and close to bankruptcy. Now that the buildings are up (but not paid for), the new emphasis has shifted to "academic quality" and the type of education one expects from a "mature" institution. Can such quality be obtained with centralized decision-making? If additional faculty input is required, how can this power be transferred? What does "dual leadership" have to do with this process? Can their paternalistic organization which has served well a religious faculty, a rural student body, and a new lay faculty remain effective as all three groups continue to grow? One is tempted to see this college in terms of a maturing family. Thus far, the tensions created by this growth process have been dissipated by their willingness to allow conflict. Questions about decision-making were part of a year-long study by most of the community. The challenge will be to maintain a strong community relationship among mature individuals. One wonders if the dual leadership model will be appropriate for their needs.

A second problem concerns the increased pressures for "efficiency." It should be relatively easy to install an MIS which will advance their offices out of what one person called the "horse-and-buggy age." It might be more difficult to deal with issues of "faculty production and evaluation." Growth contracts were tried several years ago and discarded by most of the faculty. The President talks about developing a "system to measure faculty production so that we can staff our new programs with faculty who are under-utilized." The faculty talk about new faculty for new programs. There seems to be some reluctance by the administration to pay for the talent which will be needed to administer new programs. The faculty already feels overworked with their current duties. The current Chairman of the Board of Trustees (former head of the Priory, and current Chairperson of the Nursing Division) sees the college's greatest challenge in terms of social justice. "We must develop a situation where the potential of each person is called forth, and in which students would be imbued with principles of justice to bring this kind of value orientation to those with whom they come in contact, e.g., business, nursing, teaching." This college is not alone in dealing with the tension between "efficiency" and "justice." It may be unusual in that the members of the community put such stress on the latter while outside pressures dictate the former. Can a way be found to obtain both ideals?

The final challenge is on an entirely different level. It concerns the relationship between the college and the SCC. Their pragmatic approach to institutional development has attracted them to systems which are already working, and their remoteness from Washington has led them to use more local consultants. SCC funds have allowed them to do some important things (to establish a rigorous approach to Development and Public Affairs, to create an Alternate Education Program and to begin to assemble an MIS), but they have done these things with very little direct contact and expertise from the Consortium. The challenge will be for the college and the SCC to explore new strategies for a more productive relationship.

COLLEGE E: A Small Evangelical College Experiencing A Year Of Healing

Background

College E is sponsored by an evangelical church. That relationship imparts a distinctive quality to this college. Students and faculty who are members of the sponsoring church have a strong sense of their ethnic origins, of family, of dedication to work, of simplicity of life, even of frugality. A joint emphasis on individual independence from authority and submission to the will of the community, combined with concern for peace, "servanthood", and international social justice, shape much of the developmental activities we encountered. The relationship between the tradition in which this college is rooted and its approach to individual development must be understood in order to appreciate what is happening at College E.

The college is located in a small city in a beautiful valley in a Middle-Atlantic state. The region is primarily agricultural. Most of the 1000 students (the highest enrollment in the history of the college) come from similar environments in this and three neighboring eastern states. The students and their families seek education which emphasizes preparation for careers of service, practicality, and spirituality. The curriculum responds to these expectations while maintaining a strong liberal arts emphasis. Campus life is in accord with principles of the sponsoring church: daily chapel, a signed statement of acceptable student behavior, participation in service activities, opportunities to live in small intentional communities, warm informal relationships between faculty and students, open concern with moral/ethical questions, non-violence, and a sense of "brotherhood".

The President is an internationally known pastor of the sponsoring church and has guided the college during a time of growth and innovation. Creation of an interdisciplinary general studies program and all-campus seminars focused on international justice and peace, completion of both a new library and a science building, and development of a strong administrative team are some of his accomplishments. The faculty has been active in faculty and curricular development for a number of years. It is a relatively young faculty with solid credentials and dedication to teaching in accord with the spirit of the college.

This year is described by most as "the quietest year in quite some time." This is in contrast to a few previous years. During those years a sense of financial crisis grew; faculty salaries suffered; the Board of Trustees asked for the first time that a proposed budget be revised and resubmitted; a new Dean did not perform up to expectations and was replaced; an uncharacteristic personal struggle in an academic department led to major changes in departmental personnel; a new position, Vice President for Administration, was created; and increasing diversity in the student population led to pressure for examination of certain requirements of student life (chapel, ban on dancing, etc.). Thus, this past year has been a year of "healing, not of slumber."

Characteristics of Current Institutional Development

The most notable developments are in the administration. The Vice President for Administration has encouraged administration via data-based planning and institutional research. He has made vast strides in this regard. A management information system was installed just as he arrived. However, due to bugs in the system, it is not fully operational although he expects the problems to be solved soon. He is doing the support work and design of a study of the goals of the college as perceived by its constituency. More distinctive than the shift toward systematic information-based planning is the completely open, participatory process he has installed. His approach is clearly centered on people.

The new Vice President for Academic Affairs is highly regarded by the faculty. He has served on the faculty in several influential positions. With the support of the faculty, he is the force behind present academic developments. He has started an evaluation of each department based on student reports to him and direct feedback to all department faculty. He is supporting the faculty development committee in its effort to create a systematic program. The academic Vice President chairs the committee which is studying perceived goals for the institution and hopes to link that to an assessment of course offerings. His presence and the faculty's trust in him permeate all that is happening academically. He describes this year, his first in the position, as one of learning for him.

From the faculty perspective, revision of the interdisciplinary general education program is the major developmental activity. This shift is in response to student complaints and faculty concern about the same issues: inflexibility of the program, large classes, and exclusion of non-Western concerns. In addition, students challenge the appropriateness of the "impractical" nature of these courses. The revision as approved: offers thematic courses (e.g., Toward the Year 2000) in addition to those organized around periods of history; designates existing departmental courses which may be used as part of general studies; reduces the size of teaching teams from four to two; and includes courses on non-Western culture and civilization. Plans have been completed to introduce the faculty to the program in one workshop and for the faculty teaching in the program to design the new courses in a second workshop this summer. The revisions will be implemented in September 1978.

The Faculty Development Committee worked all year on two points -- planning an acceptable evaluation system and taking ownership of the program on behalf of the faculty. Prior to this year, the Dean adopted IDEA (Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment System), but it has been found unsatisfactory by the faculty, because it did not fit team teaching and other situations specific to College E. Out of workshops and consultant visits stimulated by SCC activity last year, seven of the faculty have volunteered for evaluation/feedback by student observers. The committee is planning for a portfolio evaluation system, an activity stimulated by attendance at an SCC workshop on faculty evaluation this year. At the time of the evaluation visit, little progress had been made toward establishing faculty ownership, but that was still on the committee's agenda. In part, slow progress was attributed to the need to assure faculty that they would not be forced into unacceptable positions. An earlier committee had been perceived by a significant number of faculty, particularly in the liberal arts, as intending to force all programs into a personalized system of instruction (Keller plan) which implied competency-based education and professional/technical programs. The tension between professional and liberal education is a sore point.

Although enrollment is the highest ever, admissions and retention are still concerns. No specific percentage is stated, but it is seen as essential that a clear majority (perhaps 60-65% minimum) of students be from the sponsoring church. The denomination has other colleges. Fewer than half of the children from church families attend colleges sponsored by the church. College E has an attrition rate of 38% in the first year alone. This is due, in part, to a pattern in which young people attend a church college for exposure to Christian learning, then switch to state schools near their homes for specialization. The admissions office has taken first steps toward market analysis through the SCC. The Director of Student Life is conducting exit interviews with those leaving, a first time effort at this college.

In student development the new Director is proceeding with implementation of recommendations from a task force on student life. These recommendations focus on the affective/relational life, on integration of living and learning, and on campus moral/spiritual life, those aspects of life at College E which impact directly on student development. Progress is slow. Action is at the exploratory level but proceeding.

Activities

There has been relatively little use of outside resources beyond those mentioned above. In August a new OCC was named by the new Dean. The former OCC was to be away on a leave of absence this year. The new OCC, a professor of history, had been abroad for two years. He had one brief conversation with the outgoing OCC prior to the SCC's summer, 1977, workshop for all OCCs. When asked to take the position by the Dean, he was told the primary emphasis was to be on the humanities. By the time he learned that broad institutional development was emphasized, it was awkward for all concerned to make a change. At about that same time he learned that all SCC funds for consultants had been committed. As a result, with the exception of using funds for attendance at workshops, all institutional development was conducted within the college. The OCC was forced to engage in a holding action, serving primarily as a meeting manager.

There is a direct path from faculty development work in 1976-77 through an on-campus workshop in summer, 1977, to another on-campus workshop on student observers to the creation of a student observer program. Similarly, attendance at two SCC workshops on planning for faculty development and faculty evaluation contributed to conceptualization by the Faculty Development Committee, particularly on the use of faculty portfolios for evaluation.

Attendance at the CASC National Institute on Curriculum Development in June, 1977, and at the SCC Curriculum Development Workshop, October, 1977, contributed directly to the revisions of the interdisciplinary general studies program.

SCC advisory visits were recognized as particularly valuable by the Dean and the Faculty Development and Curriculum Revision Committees. The advisor contributed to solutions of process problems in several areas, and provided two specific content recommendations.

Overall, the SCC was used as a source of money to support solid developmental activities. Staff input from the SCC was more facilitating or catalytic than developmental.

Strengths

College E's strengths start with a good faculty supported by the heritage and mission of the sponsoring church. Their attention to students, both as teachers and as friends, is distinctive.

The two Vice Presidents must be noted next. The Vice President for Academic Affairs is unusually inspiring and trusted. He takes the initiative and acts decisively. The Vice President for Administration is a different kind of decision-maker/manager for this college. His grasp of information systems, the use of data, and all that that implies in management and planning set him apart. His people skills are especially evident in administering personnel. The emergent collaboration of these two men bodes well for the future.

Exertion of authority and leadership by the Board of Trustees is new and welcome. The Board has made clear its expectations that the administration shepherd resources and plan accordingly. The administration is working in accord with the Board in this regard.

Matters of Concern

That this has been a quiet year, a time for healing, does not mean there are no pressing issues before College E. In fact, one of the surprising aspects of the visit was the sheer number of different central issues identified as significant by those interviewed. Where on other campuses there was a total of four, five, or six significant issues mentioned, here there were 15-20. The meaning of that difference is important if it can be discerned. In the remainder of this section we attempt to organize these data into a pattern to assist in identification of that meaning.

The single most critical issue appears to be the search for the common ground on which College E is to rest. It is, and will be, clearly related to the sponsoring church. The question is : How is that relationship to be translated into a distinctive, quality education with consensus of the many constituencies which define this college? Many specific items cluster under the broader label, search for commond ground. Among them are these, not necessarily in order of significance:

Moral development of students.
Percentage of student body which must be from the sponsoring church in order to maintain identity.
Continuation of students' signed statement of behavior in the face of diversity.

Voluntarism vs. submission to community.
Preparation to live the theology of the sponsoring church in the day-to-day experience of the college (e.g., student initiated debate on the use of a bequest, not for the designated purpose - to remodel a meeting room - but to feed the hungry) and in the lives of graduates beyond college.
Best faculty now are not preachers as they once were. They also are more cosmopolitan and open to broader experiences which they see as consistent with the theology and ethics of the church. They represent a point of view and experience not always shared with other members of the church.
How to respond to the Board of Trustees' (representative of the neighboring districts of the sponsoring church) demand for quality without being wed to conservatism or becoming secularized. If perceived as the latter, the flow of students and church support would be reduced or changes in administration forced.

Accountability is the second major issue. Faculty members state that "the sheet financial emphasis is oppressive." They view the central concern of the Board and administration as "making education pay." These issues are connected to low morale over faculty salary levels and to what is seen as top-heavy administration. The Board's assertion of authority in refusing a proposed budget indicates another side of this issue. It appears that the President and the rest of the administration are in the middle of these demands.

The two preceding issues focus on the presidency. Up until now the President has operated with great success as a charismatic leader using a "vest-pocket" decision process in most significant matters. For many reasons, in the face of problems different from those he solved before, he is choosing a different kind of administrator and is encouraging those he has appointed to design systems for effective management. In responding constructively to this situation, those administrators are creating a system which, contrary to the President's successful style, emphasizes objective, data-based, long-range planning. At a July Board meeting the President will announce whether he will accept all or part of the next 4-year term to which he is elected.

Whatever he decides, it is essential that this President or his successor develop a clear leadership style consistent with the developing state of the college.

Balance between vocational curricula and the liberal arts is another major issue. College E's students (and their parents) want career preparation and want value for their tuition dollar. These concerns upset the faculty who insist that this thrust could swallow up the liberal arts, that College E could "become a technical institute." The intensity of this concern does not seem to be consistent with the long tradition of career-oriented education at College E. The faculty's treatment of the two forms of education (career and liberal education) as dichotomous, rather than seeking a shared middle ground, exacerbates the situation. This issue also relates directly to the question of identity.

The need to direct resources to refurbishing facilities and making up deferred maintenance is obvious. That will compete with other essential demands, but unless the issue is handled soon, escalating costs will induce further fiscal problems.

Student development, now being handled in a low-key but effective style, could emerge as the significant issue. That depends on what is done regarding some of the items related to finding a common ground and the vocational-liberal education split.

Future Prospects

The SCC has had limited impact at College E this year. The consortium had had a catalytic effect on internal changes during its first year. The lessened impact this year is due, in part, to the rotation of OCCs and the way the position is perceived on campus, i.e., as coordinator of meetings and as an information source without direct involvement in institutional development. If the SCC is to have greater impact on institutional development here, the consortium staff must take new initiatives. The new administrators must be educated as to how they can use the consortium to greater advantage. They do not know the range of services (many of which relate to their needs) available from the SCC nor how to gain access. This can start by assisting the Dean in choosing an OCC, defining the relationship to the SCC, and providing training to use this linkage to maximum effectiveness.

The institutional aims study, especially that part which attempts to relate perceived aims to course outcomes, is badly needed. It can help focus attention on the need for grounding in shared purpose, the vocational-liberal education division, and the question of accountability.

The new data-based administrative style could be facilitated by having the MIS operational. Some administrators question how soon the system will become operational and wonder how effective it will be. Further development in this area as a response to the demand for accountability is essential.

The role of the President and the length of his term should be made clear as soon as possible. As the transition is approached, the President is isolated and insulated from the administration other than the Vice Presidents. The college needs to redefine the role of the president particularly in regard to use of data in long-range planning. Presidential participation as the central figure in a coordinated strategy for institutional development is essential.

There is a tendency for many at College E to engage in activity for activity's sake. This is most evident in instances such as the interdisciplinary studies revision which appears to involve largely cosmetic changes. This action is neither grounded on one end by appropriate needs analysis nor anchored on the outcome side by evaluation of the extent to which the program responds to needs. The slow, unsystematic drift of the Faculty Development Committee is another version of this pattern of unanchored activities.

Summary

Taken together, the conditions for a new surge of creative developmental activity lie directly before College E. These include all of the strengths and some of the benefits of earlier efforts at institutional change or renewal. A direct attack on the matters of concern in a coherent, integrated program of institutional development with strong leadership is essential to move to the next higher level of accomplishment.

COLLEGE F: A Small Catholic College For Women

Background

College F is a Catholic college for women located in the metropolitan area of a large midwestern city. It provides a liberal arts education and offers opportunities to develop skills requisite for entry into professions. Most of its students come from urban and suburban locations in two states. Approximately 70% of the 1,100 students are Catholic.

The beauty and cleanliness of the campus and its buildings are noteworthy. The campus climate is even more striking. The top administrators are skilled, competent, and engaging. There is a spirit of justifiable pride in past efforts that is free of self-satisfaction and complacence. Faculty and administrators are dedicated to reaching new levels of achievement consistent with the mission of the college. Morale is high. The faculty clearly support the administration. Because of the high quality of working relationships, the institution responds rapidly to opportunities and challenges. This pattern is not new to College F but has been emerging over a number of years.

Characteristics of Current Institutional Development Activities

There is a cluster of issues which gives impetus to present developmental activities:

- A shrinking pool of prospective students.
- A limited endowment and need for capital improvements, notably, a new library.
- An awareness that continued proliferation and growth of high quality professional programs could shift emphasis away from the liberal arts.
- An awareness that more controlled use of resources and more systematic data-based planning are needed to do more than merely survive in the '80's.

The President, Academic Dean, OCC, Business Officer, Registrar and several committees are the principal actors in what is occurring.

The President is direct, forceful, and the recognized leader on the campus. She and five other sisters constitute the Board of Directors for the college. She is an ex officio member of all 14 standing committees, all of which report directly to her, as do all administrative officers. This organizational structure has worked well for College F. However, in the face of the issues confronting them, the administration shares an awareness that they must do long-range planning from a sound data base, rather than the more spontaneous, intuitive planning which has carried them successfully to this point.

The Academic Dean serves as a source of information, a facilitator, and a listener, and is accepting and encouraging of new ideas. The OCC has a background in research in her discipline and is planning to develop a data-based long-range planning system at the college. She is visible, respected, and clearly seen as a "data person". She is vigorous, assertive, and strong. The Business Officer describes herself as one who "buys slowly and carefully." After assuring herself that data-based planning was essential, she became an advocate and an active participant in developmental programs. The Registrar has quietly introduced electronic data processing. She publicly favors development of computer-based information systems. With a long history of participation in shaping campus life via committee work, there are a large number of faculty active in all phases of institutional development. This combination of strong, effective leadership and open participation forms the backbone of the developmental effort.

Activities

Over a period of years College F has been building toward systematic long-range planning, improving its curriculum, and exploring various faculty development activities. Grant support and participation in programs sponsored by the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) have contributed to these efforts. The thrust toward data-based planning was blunted by the inability to free a skilled faculty member to take on that task. Funding through the Title III grant to the SCC made that possible. The first year of involvement was particulary valuable to College F in that it helped train the OCC to take leadership in this area and provide assistance in exploring what was needed and what was possible. During that year visits by SCC staff helped overcome opposition to MIS and suggested how to organize for development. At the end of the first year a team attended the CASC National Conference on Curriculum Development. They returned to campus with a three-year plan to evaluate the curriculum as the start of what was to become a continuing cycle of refinement based on evaluation. Curriculum development was designated as the primary concern for 1977-78.

Soon after the start of the year, however, it became apparent that there were needs for information about many aspects of the institution if curriculum plans were to be implemented. The Campus Core Committee, which guides the Title III effort, agreed that there should be a shift in emphasis until the data relevant to curriculum development could be gathered. The Long-Range Planning Committee also decided not to meet due to the lack of a data base needed to accomplish its mission.

In order to prepare for data-based, long-range planning next year, they decided to explore MIS and to launch an integrated, systematic market analysis and an attrition/retention study to anticipate admissions problems. The group felt that this work, when completed, and the development of a long-range plan next year would facilitate curriculum development. They therefore agreed to defer action on the curriculum plan until later, when they expect to act on it themselves rather than in the Title III effort.

Following these decisions they moved ahead vigorously. They have formed separate committees on attrition/retention and marketing; have used the services of the SCC (seminars, workshops, staff consultation) in these areas; and have continued to collect and organize data related to these areas and to the campus climate in general. The net result of these activities is a shift in attitude and perception toward data-based problem-solving. There is an awareness that they must provide data to help the administrative departments and faculty committees do their jobs.

In the meantime, College F has continued with activities which will ultimately contribute to curriculum development. The major thrust came from participation in CASC activities and from the use of consultants provided by CASC to examine the core curriculum. Activities in faculty development have continued at the pace of preceding years: an annual faculty workshop, monthly faculty issues meetings, and faculty forum. A separate committee of chairpersons has focused on the creation of a voluntary faculty evaluation program. They have made extensive use of consultants but, in this case, with less progress. This appears to have resulted, in part, from a lack of interest and, in part, from outright resistance by some faculty.

Student development includes a major focus on the improvement of residence life. Enrichment of the social life of commuting students is also a continuing concern. Development of improved service by campus ministries has become a part of the student development program this year.

Strengths

The solid progress being made in institutional development appears to be related directly to these factors:

High morale.

Faculty trust in the administration.

A strong administrative team.

A visible, respected, competent OCC.

Experience with, and skill in, the use of consultants and other external resources.

Awareness that they will have to refine their use of resources.

Openness to self-examination via data-based inquiry.

A sound, positive self concept and the absense of a sense of impending doom.

The SCC has helped in this effort by providing people and resources to support College F's work in a manner which respects its autonomy and enhances the staff's capacity for independent action. The college has responded by using the entire SCC staff to the fullest. They have also used other consultants recommended by the SCC. Many people from the college have direct contact with the SCC staff members and know and value them.

Matters of Concern

Movement toward data-based decision making carries with it certain hazards. The organizational structure, until now, has exerted tight control over the flow of information. To date, that has worked well for College F. However, as more and more departments and committees gain direct access to data and learn to use it in problem solving, the present structure is likely to experience increasing stress. The system is now participatory but not in the sense that participants decide by voting. They can contribute fully to committee deliberations or can go directly to the President. In either case they are heard. The President then decides, with the good of the college the deciding factor. As everyone becomes better informed, they will be better prepared to judge the quality and timeliness of decisions and will be better able to participate directly in decision-making. Organizational development to accommodate this change is likely to be a need. Without it, faculty and administration will probably feel increasingly confined and unfulfilled.

This situation is affected by the knowledge that next year will be the last for the current President. The choice of a new president is critical. Someone hostile to the present approach toward institutional development could have extremely negative effects on the morale of those who are most actively involved. A new president, inexperienced with, or indiffernet to, data-based decision-making could induce a long time lag in implementation. All administrators central to the development process must be sensitive to the potential for setback or delay and plan accordingly. If the new president is completely supportive, it will be important that the development process be shaped to accommodate her style and expectations.

Implementation of the curriculum development plan is a major challenge. Underlying the plan are two potential hazards: evaluation seen as a veiled attempt to increase faculty productivity, and competition between liberal arts and professional education. Evaluation is the heart of the proposed plan. There is already resistance to, and suspicion of, voluntary evaluation in the existing faculty development program. It seems likely to spread to the curriculum plan as well. If either curriculum or faculty development is to move forward systematically, this problem must be solved.

There are 47 majors offered by 23 departments with 68 full-time and 63 part-time faculty. Full-time faculty are, for the most part, in liberal arts areas; part-time people are in the professional fields. They all recognize the need to blend liberal education with education for careers. They are justly proud of their accomplishments in professional fields. Regularly, we were told in glowing terms about the excellence of these programs by people in all areas. However, debate about the curriculum frequently focuses on territorial issues and procedural matters (e.g., whether or not part-time faculty vote on curriculum changes). Obviously, there are difficult educational, organizational, and individual issues involved in the debate over the curriculum. The question is whether they will be addressed clearly and directly from a sound position rooted in information, or whether they will be clouded by wrangling over "political" and narrow personal concerns. Developmental activities to achieve the former are possible.

As the attrition/retention and marketing studies progress, admissions and student life may have to be raised in priority from their present position. That may require increased allocations of resources (people and money) and more specialized training for present staff. Attention to these developmental task in long-range planning is one obvious remedy.

Future Prospects

A solid core of dedicated personnel in a supportive climate offers assurance that the present high level of activity and high contact with the SCC will carry forward successfully into the next year. As the next level of development is achieved, it will be up to those at College F and the SCC staff to discover ways to collaborate to reach even higher levels of integrated activity. Commitment, willingness to work, and ability are available in ample supply. Organizational development and and systems thinking linked to the data-based decision-making and long-range planning which are now being developed are likely areas for future learning.

COLLEGE G: A College Facing The Risk Of Institutional Development

Background

College G is a coeducational, residential institution that overlooks the downtown area of a medium sized southeastern city. Orginally established as a training school for Christian workers, it wasn't until 1942 that the school graduated its first four-year class. Only recently (1969) did the college receive accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In 1973 reaffirmation of accreditation was awarded for the next ten years.

The last nine years represent a period of growth at a time when the availability of monies and students was at a low ebb in higher education. The current President came to the college in 1968 and found the school lacking in both physical facilities and financial resources. Most likely he was hired because of his previous success of raising building funds and for his "expansionist administrative style." Currently, the campus shows six new buildings and a fall (1977) enrollment of 800. Still, there are some apparent facility needs (e.g., a new chapel and student center). The President has adopted the position that further growth must occur without increased indebtedness. Actually, his five-year plan includes the optimistic goal of eliminating the school's rather substantial short term debts.

A major problem presently confronting the college is student recruitment and retention. After six years of consistent increases in enrollment to a peak 1975 fall enrollment of 856, the college experienced two successive years of decline. The attrition rate currently stands at 56% for the first two years.

The college has very strong church ties. The Board of Trustees is elected by the several districts of the denomination which comprise the Southeast Educational Zone (eight states). The church contributes a large portion of the school's budget. Also, 80% - 85% of the students are church-affiliated and come from the school's assigned recruiting territory (educational zone). Administration and faculty view the denomination's continual support as being a major factor in their survival through the '80's.

The college has 13 departments and 35 degree programs. B.S. and B.A. degrees are given in 27 programs with A.A. degrees coming from the remaining eight programs. The school is proud of its recently formed Economics and Business Administration Department and its Allied Health Department, which offers a physician associate B.S. degree and a medical associate A.A. degree. The Fine Arts, Communication-Speech, and Religion Departments are mentioned as the strongest departments. Education is currently developing the school's first graduate program. Located off-campus is the school's adult education program. This program stimulates considerable controversy among faculty and administration. All agree, however, that it provides the college with an important source of revenue.

There are 40 full-time faculty, 11 administrators, and 17 part-time faculty. Ninety percent of the faculty are church-affiliated with 50% of the full-time faculty having received their undergraduate degree from the college. Forty percent have their doctorate. At one time "the faculty had an image problem but within the last five to eight years our confidence as a faculty has improved to where it is no longer an issue."

Students are viewed as exerting good leadership and as having an opportunity to participate in the affairs of the college. Both students and faculty agree that student life is "very hectic" because of "a lot of student activities and local church involvement," and because a large proportion "work for money while in school." Dormitory life is seen as "not a quality existence."

Administratively the school faces a major challenge. The President sees himself as highly democratic, giving complete autonomy to his administrators. He hopes to shift more of the college's financial accountability to the department level. He is "optimistic about the future." There is no question that he is intuitive, energetic, and rather individualistic. He talks not in terms of holding enrollments stable, but of increasing enrollment to 1,000. He has a five-year plan (even though he says he does not plan to "stay around here that long") to reduce indebtedness and to add a new chapel. He sees the faculty as "coming along" and "more interested in self-improvement." He values the new standing committee structures (Committee of Chairpersons, Executive Committee) and talks in terms of having tried last year to get too many people involved with helping him run the college. (In the coming year the Executive Committee is to be made up of five key administrators, replacing this year's President's Cabinet which was comprised of ten administrators.) He also sees the college needing a management information system to direct short- and long-term planning via the Institutional Planning Committee.

On the other hand, many of the President's administrators feel that the President accepts too much responsibility for running the school, is too optimistic about the future, and needs a master plan tied to sound fiscal planning. Structurally, there is confusion about the role and authority of the new committees. This year turnover was high among administrators. Replacements primarily are made by shifting administrators around (e.g., the Director of Admissions and Public Relations to Director of Extramural Studies; Director of Athletics to Dean of Students) and/or eliminating positions (e.g., Executive Director).

At issue here is not who is right or wrong. It is more a matter of two forces, which derive their impetus from different perspectives of the college's situation, finding ways to confront differences. As one administrator put it, "When there is strong disagreement among us, our church background makes it difficult to directly confront one another."

Since 1973 the college has been actively involved with institutional development. Starting with faculty evaluations, then moving into faculty growth contracts, and more recently covering course design and teaching skills, the college has a history of faculty development. Curriculum development became a second emphasis, flowing out of faculty development. What was the

Faculty Development Committee was expanded to include extra people and became the Curriculum Development Committee. Curriculum development efforts produced a revision in the general education curriculum, a change that faculty and adminstrators feel is more value-based and responsive to the school's educational mission. Next year the committee will look at their majors. Eventually, the committee plans to identify the various kinds of skill improvements necessary for the faculty to implement successfully the new general education curriculum and the various majors. Out of this effort they hope to be able to develop a distinctive set of educational programs which will continue to capture the attention of their student clientele.

Last year, in addition to participating in the SCC, the college was the recipient of a bilateral Title III grant. The latter was used to support four program areas: career planning and placement, curriculum development, administrative development and faculty development. A major outcome was the creation of the Career Planning and Placement Center. The center is staffed by a full-time Director and Associate Director and is entirely funded by the grant. The OCC manages and attempts to integrate both Title III grants. As he pointed out, "The bilateral, because of its size, overshadows the SCC grant." In fact, most administrators do not differentiate between the two. They tend to think in terms of all activities being supported by the bilateral. For next year the college has requested seven program areas to be funded by that larger grant.

With enrollment down for the second consecutive year, an attrition rate of 56% for the combined freshman and sophmore years, and five new Directors of Admissions in the last six years, the college chose to use the SCC to help develop a viable admissions and retention program. A new Director of Admissions was hired, and he worked closely with SCC staff and consultants to change "a fragmented and amateur approach to admissions" into a planful, goal-directed admissions program. There is every indication that admissions has been turned around. So far they are ahead of their projected goals. The Director feels the entire school is supporting his work. He specifically commented on the fact that the President is standing behind his program to the extent of meeting his request for two additional staff. Also, the Director feels that "We wouldn't be where we are today if we didn't have SCC's help."

Because of the work of the OCC and various workshops presented by the SCC, a Retention Committee was formed and a commitment was made to create the position of Director of Retention and Student Development. A person was identified from within the college and plans were made to move him into this slot. (An interim person filled the slot this year.) But the resignation of the Dean of Students meant a shift of that person into the Dean's slot, and the Director's position remains unfilled. Current plans are to ask for funding from the bilateral Title III grant to hire a new person for the position.

It is difficult to separate the effects of past development efforts and the bilateral BIDP from the SCC project. General comments made about the impact of the SCC on the school's overall development are most likely representative of the mixing of various efforts. Nevertheless, the college gives the clear impression that it is highly involved and committed to the concept of institutional development. One cannot help but be impressed by the amount of activity directed at development. All facets of the school seem to be touched by these efforts. Yet, the OCC feels that the most significant impact of the SCC has been on the attitudes of administrators and faculty toward the concept of "development." He believes "They feel they can change" -- the "climate is different" and it supports the acknowledgement of problems. Another administrator commented, "The grant money has allowed leaders to emerge -- to get new ideas or visions of what can be." Still another administrator said, "This has been our most productive years since I've been here." Even with all of the positive activity and testimonials, there remain a number of major issues facing the college.

As is too often the case, the major strength of a school may be the very factor which contributes to many of its current issues. Specifically, College G's relatively successful history at institutional development (as reflected in five years of effort and two grants) has produced a faculty and administration that want to be more "involved in charting the direction of the institution." They no longer "have an image problem" or lack confidence. Instead, they are "concerned with self-improvement," feel like leaders, have "ideas and visions" and know they "can change." General terms like "sound fiscal management," "data-based decision-making," "long-range planning," "management information systems," "early warning system," etc., are indicators of a shift toward system level thinking. And, contrary to what some faculty and administrators think, the President appears to welcome this development. Yet, as a group they are struggling with how to change their developmental emphasis.

In the past the institution has been successful at differentiating itself; that is, working on making each facet of itself stronger and stronger. But, their past success is now forcing them toward operating in a more integrated, interdependent manner. As would be expected, when trying to make this transition from an emphasis on differentiation to one of integration, there are: 1) many attempts at restructuring (vis-a-vis committees, new positions, new programs and new clientele); 2) a higher turnover, especially among top people; 3) the use of consultants to bring a given facet more in line; and 4) personality clashes with even a direct confrontation or two. It is at this time that the institution is most vulnerable but also most alive.

With this transition taking place over the next few years, College G will face a number of specific challenges. The major one is to create among faculty, students, and administrators a sense of confidence in the school's fiscal capability. The fact that the President has seen tougher times does not help those who do not share his optimism.

Another challenge is the development of a master plan tied to long-term fiscal planning. Such a plan can be shared at the administrative and department levels. It would facilitate the President's desire to turn over more of the institution's fiscal accountability to the departments. The new committee structures are already set in place to start this developmental effort.

The third challenge has to do with the off-campus, adult education program and other Extramural Studies Programs. The lack of coordination of these programs with the school's overall planning and development (as well as major confusion generated by these programs at the day-to-day operations level) produces a "potential bombshell." Questions of quality and ethics will continue to surface until there is a better understanding among faculty and administrators of "how they fit."

COLLEGE H: A Typically Unique Small College

Background

College H is located in a midwestern town of some 40,000 people. Founded in 1882, the majority of its buildings are less than 20 years old. While the college has church support and affiliation, less than 5% of the student body is attached to this denomination. The church does supply 60% of the Board of Trustees, while most of the other board members are executives of corporations located in the region.

Student enrollment peaked at 1201 in 1968-69 but declined steadily until last fall, when the enrollment advanced by 7%. People are proud of this rise "We were one of the few liberal arts colleges in the state which had an increase." However, uncertainty has returned and the admissions picture for next year is "discouraging." Approximately 70% of the 811 (FTE) students come from a 200-mile radius; 70% receive financial aid, and the parents of the majority did not attend college. Few of their students go on to graduate school.

The largest programs are in business/economics and education, but the fastest growing ones are in a unique new program and theatre. The latter program has grown because their new Director of Theatre has been "very aggressive in recruiting." The unique program - which began as a two-year program - has attracted affluent students from all parts of the nation. Nearly everyone on campus sees this program as being significant to the college. Indeed one administrator noted, "I wonder where we would be today if we hadn't created that program."

The overall competition for students is intense. The Admissions Department reports that there are over 50 other small liberal arts colleges in the state; a large state university is only 26 miles away. Many faculty and staff see the declining enrollment as the major concern of the college. An administrator states, "The faculty watch the admissions reports like the stock market. You can feel shifts in morale according to whether these reports are up or down. Enrollment figures are a reminder that we don't seem to be making things work." And yet there is a "comfortable" feeling about the place. Faculty report that they "thoroughly enjoy teaching here," or "We can deal with the average kid and provide an education that he or she couldn't get elsewhere. I feel good about the college and would like to see my daughter go to school here." Another states, "The faculty really care about teaching and working with students as individuals... the people here are nice - I'm comfortable here." While many see student attrition as a major problem, students report that the college is "fun... the faculty seems to care about us and we are getting a good education. If only they would change the restrictions on liquor on campus."

Faculty/Administration Relations

From an outsider's point of view, one of the most remarkable things about this college is that there is so little agreement about the state of faculty/administration relations. One faculty member sees the administration as "laissez-faire," another as "autocratic," a third finds administrators to be "workers not leaders." A few tell how the administration supported their personal growth - others find the same administrators "cold and impersonal." One faculty member feels a "we-they" attitude towards the administration. Another says, "I have no negative impressions about the college leadership."

There could be several explanations for these differing opinions. One person states, "Each side has its own turf. The faculty controls the curriculum - the administration does the rest." And yet conversations reveal that many faculty are very concerned with the external factors of costs and enrollment - the administration talks about improvements in their internal operations and new programs. Thus, uncertainty concerning responsibilities could create different perceptions of relationships.

A second explanation could be that top administrators do not seem to have a dominant leadership style. The President describes himself as "very normal. I have a leadership which is a mixed bag and is hard to label. I am not naturally an easy-in-the-saddle guy. I believe in democracy, but it is easy for me to become autocratic." The Dean is perceived as "low key" and as someone who is very "supportive."

A third explanation may be found in the lack of agreement over where college leadership should reside. A few faculty prefer a "strong autocratic" leader. Others are committed to "collegiality." The President reports, "My objective has been to wean people gradually - to get them to accept more responsibility." He finds the faculty to be "good teachers - I don't know a single one who doesn't care about the students. But their greatest weakness is that they are too compliant with each other."

A final explanation could lie in the image (or lack thereof) which people have of the college. A surprising number of faculty continue to refer to working at an "invisible college" - a reference to the title of a Carnegie Study made over 7 years ago. The President says that when he first came on campus 6 years ago, he interviewed each faculty and staff member to find out what they expected from their new president. "Their overwhelming desire was for me to give them a sense of identity... most felt that the school had no perceived goals or was different from any other small college." As a result, "We spent the next two years hammering out institutional goals. These get down to providing a blend of liberal arts with career education, paying particular attention to the individual student, and serving the educational needs of the community." Differences in opinion over faculty/administration relations may be attributed to the degree to which people can identify with these institutional goals.

The College And The SCC

The OCC was hired two and a half years ago as Assistant to the President. Today the Directors of Admissions, the Computer Center and Institutional Research report to him. Many seem to agree with the person who said, "He has no direct responsibilities. I would expect that he will go when the soft money runs out." The OCC sees himself as an "internal consultant. . . I really don't mind the ambiguity of the position. In fact, I appreciate the freedom which it gives me to tackle new problems." While others perceive him as "temporary," those who work with him report that he is "honest and candid." "He can also be a diplomat and is not always the 'President's man'." Another faculty member feels he is "unique to this campus - some administrators avoid taking stands . . . he seems to enjoy solving problems." Many, including the President, like his "systematic approach to problem-solving."

Evidence of the leadership style of the OCC and how it differs from others on campus might be seen in the way in which he directed their acquisition of a new computer. Several faculty members report that the usual method for decision-making is what they term "the hurry-up-and-wait syndrome." "Typically, we react to a crisis, set impossible deadlines, and then wait around for something to happen." In contrast, the OCC seemed to have exerted a firm but steady pressure to get a decision on their new computer. "I saw that the school needed a new computer. Our old one kept breaking down, and our offices were inefficient. Three of us did a lot of homework on both the hard- and softwear, and when we had made the decision, we forced others to accept it." He continues, "Many people didn't like this procedure, but I have confidence that it will work out. Already some of the critics have seen what it can do even though it was only installed two months ago." People have objections to this process - indeed several administrators are outspoken on the subject on the grounds that either they were not consulted or that the OCC is not a prime user. However, one faculty member states, "I favored his approach because I wanted someone to make decisions which he felt were for the good of the school. I didn't want a computer expert in that position."

The OCC feels that their use of the SCC staff has been "low" while their activities under the grant have been "extremely high." He attributes this to several factors. First, the college has received an average of $80,000 per year for the past 12 years as part of a three-college, local consortium. Since these larger funds have been used to meet special needs for things like faculty development, career education, and remedial reading, SCC funds could focus upon the "central issue of administrative development." Thus money was used to support particualr projects in Institutional Research (department salary costs, enrollment trends and instructional costs), to determine the best computer package, and to produce an AIDP. He describes the latter venture as "overwhelming - it was the most significant project of my life."

A second reason for not using the SCC more directly deals with his estimation of the college's particular needs. "We are way ahead of most schools in long-range planning, and we know basically what we want from our MIS. While I used some outside help to polish up our AIDP, that had to be an internal operation."

There may be a third reason for their relationship to the SCC. Since the OCC considers himself as an "internal consultant", he may not appreciate outside interference. While the SCC staff was reported to be "very helpful" during either their on-campus visits or in off-campus workshops, there still is little doubt as to who is in charge of the project.

Issues For The Future

In many respects this is a typical small college. Its lovely campus, its location away from city life, its dedicated faculty, its comfortable pace, these are all part of the vision many have of what a small college should be like. However, the school may not be typical with regard to its adaptability and willingness to change its curriculum or calendar and its creativity in new program design. One administrator believes, "We are the least resistant to change of anybody I know." One sign of this adaptability is the lack of any major cutbacks when their enrollment declines. While the President attributes this successful adaptation to their ability to reduce the student/faculty ratio and "luck", the fact is that they have adapted to a decline in student enrollment of nearly 20% without major cutbacks. Their challenge will be to continue such adaptability in the future and still maintain a coherent mission for the school. Some fear that their very willingness to change could be their downfall. One faculty member states, "Our biggest problem is selecting programs which are more than trendy." The President is openly concerned that they have already reduced the role of the liberal arts. Given the tremendous competition for students and the number of schools which "look like us", how can this college create new institutional goals which both build on its internal strength in the liberal arts and also meet the long term demands of the external market? While the unique new program is impressive, it also has changed the school in a variety of subtle ways. Should three or four more new programs of this nature be implemented, will the changes remain subtle? How would such change affect the alumni, the faculty, the "traditional" student body, and the relationship to the sponsoring church? In short, just how adaptive *can* and *should* the college be?

A second issue concerns its decision-making process and clarity of responsibility. This college is rather typical in that relationships between the faculty and administration are not always harmonious. Yet this observation should not be pushed too far, for, as one person noted, "There are tensions but no obnoxious issues. Faculty/administration relationships are good most of the time - certainly better than I've seen on a lot of campuses." The tensions which do exist may revolve around the issue of clarity about responsibilities. The faculty seem to be responsible for the internal matters of curriculum, yet the decline in enrollment has focused their attention upon external factors such as admissions. The administration seems responsible for external finances, yet it talks about new programs. This lack of clarity can cause friction.

For example, the administration has suggested that the faculty play an active role in student recruitment, and the few who have become involved have had impressive results. However, most faculty resent this suggestion for they feel this is not part of their job. Another example concerns responsibility in the establishment of new programs. Last year a para-legal program was established by the faculty. Publicity seems to have been late, and by the end of June two or three students had enrolled in the program. Since the faculty had left campus, the administration felt a responsibility to cancel the program on their own. Faculty resentment of this move was intensified when greater student interest was expressed later that summer. The issue seems to be: who was responsible for the follow-up on this program? The faculty seem to have felt that once they created the program, follow-up was the job of the administration, yet they objected when the administration cancelled the program. The administration feels the faculty might have been more active in recruiting new students to the program. The key issue does not seem to be faculty recruitment as much as the type of decision-making which can effectively clarify these responsibilities.

The first issue concerned setting institutional goals, the second was developing an effective mechanism for implementing such goals. The third issue - while much more specific - is a part of these broader problems. It concerns the role of the OCC and the college's relationship to the SCC. The OCC is perceived to lack specific responsibility. While several offices "report" to him, the lines of authority between him and other top administrators are not clear. One administrator feels "the OCC's role is very unique - it seems to have evolved into a position of irrelevance." Others, while expressing high regard for the OCC's abilities, see this position as "temporary." The OCC himself seems to enjoy this ambiguity for he feels that it increases his flexibility in problem-solving. Yet others are concerned because they don't feel he is responsible for the day-to-day implementations of his solutions. This issue spills over to the college's relationship with the SCC.

There is no doubt that SCC funds have been spent wisely. A team did explore various data management systems, decisions were made on hard- and software, and the new computer is installed and working. Consultants and workshops were utilized for enrollment development. Formulating an AIDP was a huge undertaking. Indeed their funding of such specific activities has reduced the waste associated with "activity for activity's sake." The cost of this approach is that the SCC has not had a chance to provide a focus for their institutional development. It may be that such focus is inappropriate at this time. The school did establish institutional goals in the recent past. The AIDP - if funded - could provide focus in the future. However, once again, the question concerns the mechanism for establishing viable goals and assigning responsibility for their implementation.

College H seems to be a rather typical small college, partly because it has some very unique characteristics. Their challenge will be to continue to develop unique programs while maintaining their reputation as a small college which effectively blends the liberal arts with career education.

Appendix 2: Issue-Focused, Functional Analysis of Five Technical Assistance Delivery Areas

A. MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The purpose of the Small College Consortium project (SCC) is to provide comprehensive technical assistance (TA) to the 54 member institutions in the four major areas of: A) Planning, Management Information Systems, and Fiscal Management; B) College Resource Developments; C) Program Development; and D) Professional Development. Each TA area is further divided into three or four sub-areas. For the second year of the project the SCC staff identified management information systems (MIS) as a primary area of focus within the first broad TA area. This report presents a brief summary of the results of the assessment process employed to determine delivery effectiveness in the MIS area.

Methodology

To assess the effects of TA delivery in the area of MIS, an external evaluator worked with the Technical Assistance Director in charge of Planning, Management Information Systems, and Fiscal Management. Together they identified issues which they believed should be assessed. These issues were used to focus instrumentation on the important aspects of TA delivery.

The following steps summarize the assessment process which culminated in this report:

1. A three hour interview with the TA Director to elicit a description of activities, strategies, and perceived effects as the basis for jointly defining assessment issues;
2. Designing instruments to collect data and identifying samples of institutions and key persons from whom data were to be collected;
3. Collection of data and compilation of information into interpretable form;
4. Review findings with the Director and solicit his reactions;
5. Review findings with SCC Executive Director;
6. Prepare report describing findings and conclusions.

Interview with Director

The TA Director's efforts at MIS development concentrated on workshops and campus visits. Workshops were used: 1) to help institutions decide whether to invest in short-term and long-term planning or not to invest resources at this time, and 2) to help institutions create planning models if they wanted to move forward toward MIS development. On-campus visits usually followed workshop activities. The Director was often invited to the campus to help with an immediate problem. From either position, the Director provided a variety of specific consultation activities to further MIS development. The following is a list of identified activities:

- review of office personnel
- meeting with president and other concerned administrators
- introductory general session on campus with functional users
- educational sessions on campus with functional users
- review of hardware/software alternatives
- meeting with various office personnel to ascertain information needs (usually 1 1/2 to 2 day experience)
- assistance in design of information system to include forms, procedures, file layout or others
- consultation with data processing personnel on programming and/or hardware questions
- meeting with students to clarify objectives of management information system
- act on behalf of institution when dealing with computer hardware/software vendors.

The major issue identified was directed at the Director's perceived delay between staff interventions (workshops/on-campus visits) and resultant action on the part of the colleges. Specifically, the Director believed that an assessment of the MIS technical assistance area should: 1) ascertain the perceptions of key college personnel as to whether unreasonable delays occurred between an SCC staff MIS intervention and resultant action; and 2) to collect views as to why such delay(s) occur(s).

MIS Implementation Survey

In order to provide information on the delay issue, a questionnaire was designed to assess key college personnel views on: 1) the "delay of action" problem, and 2) internal and external factors that work against more immediate action after a consultation or workshop.

Part I of the questionnaire asked the respondent to check those activities/services provided by the Director. Next to those activities checked, the respondent wrote briefly: 1) what he/she hoped would be the desired outcomes stemming from these activities, and 2) next to the desired outcomes, what actual outcomes had occurred to date. The writing down of desired outcomes and actual outcomes provided the information for the last question, "Place a check where there was an undesirable delay in reaching desired outcomes."

Part II of the questionnaire listed a number of specific conditions which may slow up the change process. These conditions were grouped into external and internal categories. Many of the external conditions listed revolved around the activities and style of the consultant, in this case the Director. The internal reasons were mainly those under the control of the college. The respondent was asked to review the delay area he/she had previously checked. Then, the respondent was asked to check those conditions, both external and internal, which he/she felt contributed to the delay(s). Respondents were told to check as many conditions as applied.

The questionnaire was mailed to approximately 70 individuals representing 26 colleges.

Part I results from 29 questionnaires are summarized below:

Frequency of Activities	Frequency of Delays	Percentages of Perceived Delays in Action
Workshops		
18 General MIS Workshop, (April, 1977)	10	56%
16 MIS Workshop (Student Information, October, 1977)	6	38%
8 MIS Workshop (Financial Information, March, 1978)	3	38%

Frequency of Activities	Frequency of Delays	Percentages of Perceived Delays in Action
Campus Visits		
17 Review of office personnel	8	47%
21 Meeting with president & other concerned administrators	7	33%
14 Introductory general session on campus with functional users	8	57%
6 Educational session on campus with functional users	2	33%
8 Review of hardware/ software alternatives	4	50%
13 Meeting with various office personnel to ascertain information needs (usually 1-1/2 - 2 day experience)	4	31%
4 Assistance in design of information system to include forms, procedures, file layout or others	1	25%
5 Consultation with data processing personnel on programming and/or hardware questions	2	40%
4 Meeting with students to clarify objectives of management information systems	0	0%
1 Act on behalf of institution when dealing with computer hardware/software vendors	0	0%
TOTALS:		
135	55	41%

Part II results are summarized below:

A. External Conditions Contributing to Delay in Action Frequency

9 No written report by consultant

1 Written report too late

3 Too much jargon

3 No personal relationship

0 Consultant didn't understand our situation

0 Consultant was too "different"

3 No phone calls or other follow-up

1 No written/reference materials

2 Too much information

0 Information too impractical

10 Not enough specific "how to's"

0 Not enough information

1 Area too technical

9 Consultant's level of expertise threatens office personnel (faculty and admin.)

3 No local, outside help available

2 Consultant appears too busy and therefore we do not ask for assistance

1 Consultant is not patient

5 Consultant delivers information too quickly (no time allowed for assimilation/questions)

7 Not enough budget to provide outside follow-up support

0 Consultant's level of enthusiasm is too high

2 Consultant is insensitive to our situation

4 Not enough specific recommendations

0 Workshop didn't capture our people's interest

1 Workshop assumed too broad a knowledge base

1 The right people didn't attend the workshop

0 The workshop discouraged us from trying MIS

TOTAL 68

B. Representative Examples of Write-in Comments

- The one-day visits are nice but we need a consultant who can come to campus for a month and do some of the follow-up on the ideas to put the systems in place and train our staff in maintaining the systems. (President and Executive Vice President)

- They have a planned sequence of events and are still following that plan. If anything is causing the delay, it is a lack of time.

- Greg does not always submit a written report after a visit, but I cannot really say the lack of a report accounts for any delay in accomplishing objectives. A report would be reassuring to campus administrators, it would satisfy the recommendations concerning proper use of consultants, and it would provide documentation of the consultant's visit for later reference purposes. (On-Campus Coordinator)

- Greg sometimes gives more information than some of the college personnel can absorb during one visit or one interview with him. However, he always reinforces on his next visit what was presented the first time, and in the process of implementing what he has presented the staff becomes more familiar with it. On the other hand, while his initial presentation may seem to be more than the staff can assimilate, it does serve the very useful purpose of setting directions, presenting an overall picture, and giving them a forward look to ultimate objectives. (On-Campus Coordinator)

- We are extremely pleased with Greg's efforts on our behalf, and we are now on target for implementation of suggestions by fall 1978. (Executive Vice President)

- Regarding some of the conditions listed above, Greg understands only too well our situation, is very sensitive and caring to our situation. It would have been impossible for his level of enthusiasm to be too high; enthusiasm is one of the things this campus needs. (On-Campus Coordinator)

- Although unavoidable due to other internal priorities, consultant is sometimes pressed for time to fully explore details of specific development program. (Director of Development)

- I feel Greg did a good job. The problem lies with the inability of people on campus to remember what needs to be done and "punish" themselves by discipline to accomplish their first goal. (Assistant Director of Admissions)

C. Internal Conditions Contributing to Delay in Action

10	College staff not capable of implementation
9	Lack of administrative support
3	Physical surroundings not adequate
0	Recommendations inconsistent with school's philosophy
5	Recommendations not on target with college priorities
1	Timing was bad
3	Lack of faculty support
1	Lack of student support
6	Lack of broad-based institutional support
13	Lack of resources
13	Other problems became the priority
1	Low energy of staff and/or faculty
9	Inability to redistribute time, money, priorities
1	Wrong area of focus

2 Lack of focus on specific problem areas

4 Lack of awareness of available solutions

12 Resistance to change

3 Inability to focus on tasks

1 Too many things already on the computer

3 Task too large to undertake

TOTAL 100

D. Representative Examples of Write-In Comments

- We need additional personnel. (President and Executive Vice President)

- Although neither Greg nor I realized it at the time, we were stepping on a very strong territorial imperative held by the Vice President of Business Services. If I had understood this clearly, it is possible that the preparation for Greg's visit could have been improved to the point that a delay would not have occurred. If I were to do it all over, knowing what I know now, I would have our advisor (Joan) carefully pave the way with the Vice President of Business Services and have Joan and Greg work in tandem directly with him. (On-Campus Coordinator)

- Several of those most resistant to change also believe that with prayer and counseling, Greg's condition can be cleared up. (Vice President)

- Greg's observations were insightful and accurate - as the results themselves bear out. (Vice President for Business Affairs)

- For the most part, delay in reaching ultimate goals due to a time/personnel factor. Greg can give more than the college staff can handle initially because too few people have too much to do within too little time, and a disruption in existing, known ways of doing things always has a temporary slowing-down effect. Budget limitations are another factor which must be contended with. Much has been accomplished considering the fact that no new furniture may be purchased and that funds are lacking for the printing of new forms, etc. (On-Campus Coordinator)

- I would say the program is a major priority for the college, but strategic planning with other areas has caused delay. (Executive Vice President)
- A mini-computer became available, and practically the whole year was taken up in transferring existing software from our old timesharing systems to the on-campus computer. (On-Campus Coordinator)
- As programs develop, greater staff support will be needed in development. (Director of Development)
- Greg served us well last year as a consultant and has provided much valuable support through workshops this year. As consultant he has totally lost our confidence. (On-Campus Coordinator)
- No "felt need." Our admissions is booming and OCC needs to rely more on Presidential support. (On-Campus Coordinator)
- Some people resist change because, I feel, it threatens them in their positions. "If no one else knows what I am doing, then they can't say I'm not doing it." Others because they cannot understand how to change without muddying the water. (Assistant Director of Admissions)

Summary

Summarizing the results of Part I and Part II, we can say that the average respondent reported:

4.7 activities "which you or your institution were a part of"

1.9 "undesirable delays in researching the desired outcomes"

40% Delay Rate

2.3 external conditions were seen as slowing up the change process

3.4 internal conditions were seen as slowing up the change process

High incidence external conditions mentioned were:

10 not enough specific "how to's"

9 no written report by consultant

9 consultant's level of expertise threatens office personnel (Faculty and Administration)

High incidence internal conditions mentioned were:

13 lack of resources

13 other problems became the priority

12 resistance to change

10 college staff not capable of implementation

Director's Reaction to Assessment Data

The findings from the assessment process were presented to the Director for his review. Overall, he was pleased with the assessment data. As is evidenced by the frequency of activities, he made a considerable number of on-campus visits over the last year. The delay rate confirmed his belief that there were unnecessary delays between his interventions and resultant action on the part of colleges. He felt that the perceived delay rate (40%) was unnecessarily high. He commented that the internal and external conditions checked provided clues for reducing the rate. These data provided only one surpise, "not enough specific 'how to's.'" The Director felt that "being specific" was one of his strong points. Finally, the Director commented that the assessment data would influence his planning of next year's activities.

B. ENROLLMENT DEVELOPMENT

Under the broad technical assistance area called College Resource Development are five sub-areas: 1) Recruitment and Admissions, 2) Financial Aid, 3) Retention and Attrition, 4) Marketing, and 5) Financial Resource Development. For the second year of the project the SCC staff identified Retention and Attrition and Recruitment and Admissions as two primary areas of focus within the College Resource Development rubric. The two sub-areas were labeled Enrollment Development. This report presents a brief summary of the results of the assessment process employed to determine TA delivery effectiveness in the enrollment development area.

Methodology

To assess the effects of TA delivery on the problem area of enrollment development, an external evaluator worked with the Technical Assistance Director in charge of this TA area. Together they identified issues and questions which they believed should be assessed. These issues were used to focus instrumentation on the important aspects of TA delivery.

The following steps summarize the assessment process which led to this report:

1. A three hour interview with the Director of Enrollment Development to elicit a description of activities, strategies, and perceived effects as the basis for jointly defining assessment issues;
2. Designing instruments to collect data and identifying samples of institutions and key persons from whom data were to be collected;
3. Collection of data and compilation of information into interpretable form;
4. Review findings with the Director and solicit her reactions;
5. Review findings with SCC Executive Director;
6. Prepare report describing findings and conclusions.

Interview with Director

The TA Director's efforts in enrollment development concentrated on creating goal-directed admissions management programs at member institutions. Specific focus on retention was often the starting point for working toward the broader program goal. The reduction of attrition was an immediate need that many institutions chose as the starting point for improving enrollment. Retention workshops were used as the primary way of addressing the retention problem. The Director's objective was to heighten a workshop participant's awareness of the value of a retention strategy for reducing attrition. A second objective was to go back to campus and spread this awareness via the development of retention task forces and the planning and implementation of specific components of a retention strategy. The Director made herself available for consultation to those colleges that needed help in setting up their retention strategies.

Many times the Director's efforts at working on the immediate problem of retention spilled over into the broader area of admissions. She would work closely with the Admissions Director and his or her staff to help them diagnose admissions problems, identify staff training needs, and provide changes which addressed these problems. In addition, an attempt was made to interface admissions with other units and offices of the institution.

Follow-Up Retention Workshop Evaluation

In the retention area the major issue identified was whether or not workshops as a delivery mode actually heightened awareness concerning the importance of retention and produced action-planning at the colleges. An end-of-workshop evaluation showed that the participants were positively affected by the workshop. The important question is whether these positive workshop learnings were enough to bring about a similar awareness and action on campus toward developing a retention strategy for reducing attrition.

Information needed to answer this concern was collected from a brief follow-up questionnaire sent to 30 workshop participants representing 30 institutions. If a school had sent more than one participant to the workshop, the choice of a respondent representative of the school was based on the respondent's local position and the availability of information on the workshop results. The questionnaire was designed to assess the workshop participants' perceptions of their colleges' efforts and accomplishments in the retention area over the last year. The Director of Enrollment Development also wanted information about anticipated needs for further outside consultation and workshop support over the next year. Results of the questionnaire are summarized below:

SUMMARY OF FOLLOW-UP RETENTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(24/30 return rate)

AWARENESS (1 = Low, 7 = High)

- retention workshop heightened your awareness $\bar{x}$ - 5.2
- able to spread awareness to broader campus $\bar{x}$ - 5.0
- impact of awareness on
    - executive management $\bar{x} = 5.2$
    - faculty $\bar{x} = 4.0$
    - student development $\bar{x} = 4.9$
    - admissions $\bar{x} = 5.7$

ACTION PROGRAMMING (1 = Low, 7 = High)

- did heightened awareness produce action programming in areas of $\bar{x} = 5.0$
    - retention task force created
      7 (yes), 10 (no, already existed),
      7 (no)

        If yes, how well working
        (N = 7) $\bar{x} = 4.6$

    - early warning system created
      9 (yes), 8 (no, already existed),
      6 (no)

        If yes, how well working
        (N = 7) $\bar{x} = 5.7$

    - flow of student information increased
      8 (yes), 8 (no)
    - degree of retention interfacing $\bar{x} = 4.0$

FUTURE

- anticipate outside consultation and workshop support
  15 (yes), 5 (no)

- efforts this year will measurably improve retention $\bar{x} = 4.5$

In addition to the information summarized above, there were two open-ended questions directed at: 1) how do you know that the flow of student information has improved such that increased retention will be a likely outcome? and 2) if you anticipate needing outside consultation or workshop support in order to more fully implement your action program, then what type of support do you envision? Below is a listing of responses to these questions:

Question 1 - Flow of Student Information

- We are working on a "climate" questionnaire which should help us.
- A number had indicated "no return" but are now returning. (Also known through individual contact and conferences.)
- We have a system of keeping better tabs on what students are doing related to retention.
- We created a student sounding board to keep the pulse of the campus and to relay information (including problems) to student retention offices.
- More sophistication.
- Attrition rate has dropped greatly this year. The number of students indicating they will be returning next fall is greater than usual.
- Still working on such flow.
- We have developed an "action-oriented" MIS and IR system and greater retention is apparent.
- Admissions office started information down through the ranks.

Question 2 - Type of Consultation and Workshop Support

- Workshops and private consultation.

- Some from _______________ will attend the CASC workshop in Peoria.

- SCC consultation to administration to point out critical needs for full college commitment to retention efforts.

- Reinforcement.

- Workshops or visits which help us look at several retention programs that are in practice and working well.

- Getting student services to realize importance of early warning system; management information system.

- Development of the interface idea - mobilizing the many working parts into a unit.

- Further ideas and inputs:

  1) Five people will be attending this June's CASC Institute, including the President.

  2) I anticipate that this will result in the creation of a task force that will include more than the present Dean of Students' staff members.

  3) If this happens, attendance of others at workshops next year would be helpful plus perhaps having a consultant to work with us on campus.

- Not sure yet.

- On-campus consultants who can look at our specifics.

- Consultation (on-campus) and workshops to be attended by our own staff.

- Just sharing ideas with other colleges is a tremendous help.

Telephone Interviews with Admission Directors

In the area of admissions, six schools were actively involved with the Director of Enrollment Development. Involvement was primarily with the respective Directors of Admissions. The Director of Enrollment Development identified seven issues or questions that she felt needed to be assessed. Specifically, she was interested in knowing the Admissions Director's perception of: 1) involvement with SCC in the area of admissions, 2) the learnings derived from this involvement, 3) the usefulness of this information, 4) the effect technical assistance had on their admissions programs, both short-term and long-term, 5) satisfaction with services and ways that services could be improved, 6) expectations for SCC involvement in admissions in the future, and 7) hunches about why things worked or didn't work.

To collect this information a structured telephone interview guide was developed. The external evaluator interviewed each Director of Admissions soliciting comments to each question. The average interview lasted 30 minutes. The external evaluator then compiled the answers to these questions into a Summary of Admissions Telephone Survey (see Addendum). The following is a brief precis of those results.

> Directors reported having received a variety of learnings from these experiences such as a "change of attitude about the importance of sound admissions planning," "new ways of improving procedures," "new specific program ideas such as an intern program" and "inquiry management." The average rating of the usefulness of this information on a scale of one (not useful) to seven (very useful) was 6.6. The effect of technical assistance on admissions programs was quite varied. Noted short-term changes included such things as a student intern program, "smoother running system," an inquiry system, "better direct mail procedure," prospect pool management and a "general follow-up system reorganized." Long-term priority changes mentioned were: "added more staff," "communicating what happens in admissions to other areas of college," "less long-distance travelling." The average rating of satisfaction was 6.4. Areas in which improvement was suggested were: 1) more follow-up reports, and 2) more contact at the school. Expectations for the future included additional services in admissions as well as moving toward marketing and management information systems. Hunches about why things worked focused on the openness of the Directors of Admissions to receive technical assistance services and the sensitivity and commitment of SCC staff.

Director's Reactions to Assessment Data

The findings from the assessment process were presented to the Director for her review. Overall, she was pleased with the assessment data. The results supported many of her views about effectiveness of workshops and on-site consultation. Her major concern was centered on next year's activities, how to serve the more advanced colleges in admissions and retention and still have the time and energy to work with colleges who have not as yet used these TA services. One clear implication of this concern is that new modes of delivery may have to be created in order to meet the anticipated increasing demand for services.

The Director also felt that the workshops on retention had served as an entry mechanism into the broader program area of goal-directed admissions management. She explained that if nothing else, they served to enhance the staff's credibility.

Finally, the Director identified that she should develop a better method of follow-through on reports summarizing her campus visits.

ADDENDUM TO PART B, APPENDIX 2

Summary of Admissions Telephone Survey

I. Please describe your involvement with the SCC in the area of admissions.

--Used outside consultants; attend conferences; Linda visited us twice; also phone and letters to her.

--Used contacts consultants; Greg and Linda visited us; Joan also.

--Linda visited us and helped evaluate our program.

--Workshop attendance (twice) -- worked with Linda -- came to campus.

--Used Greg and Linda and Joan.

--Used other consultants -- workshop, visit on campus.

II. What did you personally learn from this involvement -- please list ideas, principles, notions, etc. Also, rating of usefulness of information: 1 - not useful; 7 - very useful.

--Importance of management staff training; personal development is important; systems thinking; use of student interns.

Rating: 7

--Value of Admission Intern Program; Alumni Representative Program; me taking more direct leadership; weekly staff meetings to improve office functions; more conscious of time deadlines.

Rating: 7

--Identified better procedures for inquiry; confirmed what we know; help with personnel problems.

Rating: 6

--Ideas about admissions management; how to handle issues; inquiry management; importance of planning; aware of relation between admissions and retention; interrelatedness of issues.

Rating: 7*

*Her point of view -- "without her assistance would have been a real difficult year for me."

--*Unit planning (Greg). **Direct Mail (Linda). Clarify Ideas (Joan). Job Description and Long Range Admissions Plan (Greg and Linda) -- working out now.

*Could learn but not do
**Couldn't convert into action

Rating: 5***

***Her personal desires limited what she could do.

--New insights into inquiry management; value of student staff and how to use them; value of procedural manual.

Rating: 7

III. Specifically, what effect did the technical assistance have on your admissions program?

Short-Term Changes

--Real admissions system set up and student intern program.

--Follow-up system reorganized.

--Looking for new director and smoother running system.

--Inquiry system in terms of its management; planning events -- now we evaluate what we have done in the past.

--Office organized into efficient system; better direct mail procedure.

--Prospect pool management; student staff involvement; Campus Unit Program.

--Altered method of handling student-initiated inquiries.

Long-Term Priorities

--Added more staff which shows long-term commitment to an "admissions program."

--Develop and implement Alumni Representative Program.

--Recruiting for retention sake--making a good match; communicating what happens in admissions to other areas of college.

--Less long-distance traveling -- focus on major areas.

IV. Rating of Satisfaction with Services

Ratings: 5.5, 6, 6,
7, 7, 7

$\bar{x} = 6.4$

Comments:

--Stimulate over-thinking -- then see if we can carry it out.

--Used tact and counseling skills -- very difficult situation.

--Never asked for anything they haven't given us -- they are helpful!

V. What could be improved; where was time wasted, etc.

--Nothing major.

--I wanted more time from people; people who have come here have been very good.

--Only thing is more contact -- more time at school.

--Breakdown in coordination between consultants -- Linda and Greg.

VI. In what way/how could Linda improve the quality of her services?

--Follow-up reports; written with analysis of services.

--Has unique ability to identify strengths -- makes people feel good about what they are doing then gets them to look at weaknesses.

--Possibly -- when she relates information she seems to take to heart one person's point of view over another. This suggested to me by others.

--Linda has many good ideas; needs to follow through -- report back -- left hanging.

--Not that I know of -- no complaints.

VII. What expectations, if any, do you have for the future?

--Hope grant continues -- need help with staff training -- workshops and more consultation.

--Marketing -- identify where our strongest market is.

--Will need help once admissions person is hired; feedback to President is important.

--Get into some marketing -- college is willing to make commitment -- implement market program. Use them more this year -- take more advantage of service.

--Admissions will need their continual help.

--Want continual services -- Assistant Dean of Students will need their help.

--Would like CASC to help us out in analyzing our market.

VIII. What hunches do you have about why things worked; didn't work.

--Director of Admissions was willing to revise course of action; SCC people were willing to help me. They were open and looking for people who were willing to be helped.

--Admissions Office was open-minded. SCC put out ideas for improving situations.

--SCC staff (Linda) picked up on feelings on other matters.

--Personalities were right -- willingness on our part to take their advice. They and we were comfortable with each other. (Includes staff -- Linda, Greg, Joan, and Tom K.)

--Their concern for the institution; people know their business; good skills -- interpersonal and communications. Know whether or not you are understanding something with it. Don't come in and take over; really come in and "assist."

--We want help so she can be helpful; seems efficient and proficient. Style is very relaxed, easy to work with; I've been needing exactly what they provided.

C. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Under the broad technical assistance area called Program Development are three sub-areas: 1) Career Development, 2) Curriculum Development, and 3) Student Development. For the second year of the project, SCC staff identified curriculum development as a primary area of focus within the Program Development rubric. This report presents a brief summary of the results from the assessment processes employed to determine TA delivery effectiveness in the Program Development area.

Methodology

To assess the effects of TA delivery in the area of curriculum development, an external evaluator worked with the Technical Assistance Director in charge of Program Development. Together they identified issues which they believed should be assessed. These issues were used to focus instrumentation on the important aspects of TA delivery.

The following steps summarize the assessment process which culminated in this report:

1. A three hour interview with the Director of Program Development to elicit a description of activities, strategies, and perceived effects as the basis for jointly defining assessment issues;
2. Designing instruments to collect data and identifying samples of institutions and key persons from whom data were to be collected;
3. Collection of data and compilation of information into interpretable form;
4. Review findings with the Director and solicit his reactions;
5. Review findings with SCC Executive Director;
6. Prepare report describing findings and conclusions.

Interview with Director

The TA Director's efforts focused on campus visits as the primary mode of delivery of service for those schools who were already working on curriculum development (CD) issues. The Director felt that "there was not much curriculum development activity this year because most schools were not ready." The more developed institutions are usually the ones doing systematic curriculum development tied to long-range planning, fiscal management, and faculty and student development activities. The Director views curriculum development as an activity that should come later in the "institutional development cycle."

The Director felt that an assessment of the curriculum development process as it is currently being carried out at various institutions would help the SCC better understand how institutions are going about CD. This type of assessment would facilitate the planning of next year's activities in this TA area. Specifically, the Director believed that an assessment of the CD process at an institution should: 1) determine where the college is in the process, 2) assess how a college comes to make a decision to review its curriculum, 3) identify steps used to review the curriculum, 4) identify steps used to create new products and plans for implementation, 5) identify steps in the process of curriculum implementation and evaluation, 6) identify factors and conditions necessary for successful completion of the various steps as well as the possible blocks or barriers encountered, and lastly, 7) determine future anticipated workshop and consultation support.

Curriculum Development Telephone Survey

In order to provide information about the CD process currently being used at a selected sample of colleges, a telephone interview survey was constructed to assess eight Academic Deans' perceptions of their colleges' approach to CD. A total of eight institutions were identified. The eight institutions were chosen because according to the Director they fell into one of the following four categories: 1) Advanced work on CD; 2) Beginning work on CD; 3) Should be working on CD; and 4) Having problems with CD. The external evaluator structured a telephone interview guide which addressed the previously mentioned aspects of CD. The evaluator interviewed each of the eight Academic Deans using the telephone interview guide. The average interview lasted approximately 30 minutes. The external evaluator then compiled the answers into a summary format. The results of this summary suggested that:

1. All schools at least had gone through the curriculum review phase of curriculum development.

2. There are various factors which contribute to a school deciding to review its curriculum. They range from student pressure, request from community, hiring of a new president, outside advice, to information obtained from self-study, grant money, and low enrollment. Barriers that often keep a college from reaching a decision to review range from protection of interest, budget, lack of administrative support, too much work, to "not sure it will make an improvement," lack of interest, and unaware of need.

3. In the area of curriculum review the telephone survey revealed that most Deans had a sense of how to set up a review process, the various facilitating factors that could be used to help the review, and the barrier's working against the process. The actual steps given as the review process were quite varied from school to school. Some of the factors mentioned which either facilitate or work against the process are provided below:

Facilitating Factors	Barriers
Incentives	Top down approach
Faculty release	Lack of trust
Emphasis on faculty development	Self interest
Strong directors	Smaller classes as a potential outcome
Time lines	Department prejudices
Commitment and consensus	Complex organizational structure
Good morale	Committee structure
Desire to improve	Time
Good communication	Lack of knowledge
Leadership by more than one person	Getting off the track
	Weak leadership
	Workload
	Danger and threat
	Philosophical debates

4. In the two areas of curriculum planning and curriculum implementation, the evaluator felt there was no clear expression on the part of the Deans as to the major steps in these two phases of curriculum development. The Deans as a whole could give some steps, but one got the sense that their thinking was not as clear in these areas as in the curriculum review area. Likewise, they were not as clear about the facilitating and inhibiting factors in these two areas.

5. When asked whether or not they anticipated needing outside consultation and workshop support in curriculum development over the next year, seven said "yes" and one said "no" with a qualification. Types of support mentioned focused on "evaluation by outside consultants" to "renew the vigor of faculty and administration." Little mention was made of consultants to help them set up the necessary steps to guide them through the process and facilitate successful planning and implementing of new curricula.

Director's Reactions to Assessment Data

The findings from the assessment were presented to the Director for his review. Overall, he was not surprised by the data. He felt that the assessment supported his belief that "CD starts anywhere; goes anywhere; and reflects priority slippage." In addition, there is no apparent systematic model or approach being employed in the later phases of curriculum planning, implementation, and evaluation. The Director was somewhat surprised that his categorization of schools into Advanced, Beginning, Should Be, and Having Problems did not produce a difference in the type of information obtained. Finally, the Director hoped that the information collected by this assessment process could be used as a stimulus to encourage schools to be more planful and systematic when attempting curriculum development.

D. MARKETING

The strategy adopted in this TA area was to educate key administrators regarding the need for institution-wide marketing systems. Steps in this process were: a) to introduce top administrators to marketing terminology, practices and strategies; b) if interest was indicated, to follow up with on-site meetings to increase awareness of the value of systematic marketing to the campus community; and c) to work with key administrators and a campus-wide coordinating body to develop the appropriate steps for implementation of a marketing system. Primary events were two (Oct. 10, Oct. 12) one-day seminars on marketing designed for presidents; and follow-up visits to campuses which requested technical assistance.

Overall consideration of perceived effectiveness of what was done, how it worked and why, led to identification of these issues and questions for further assessment:

1. Those who attended SCC marketing seminars should have a higher level of sophistication about marketing than those who did not attend.

2. Did SCC seminars prepare institutions for on-site consultation marketing?

3. SCC, through on-site consultation, increased emphasis on marketing as evidenced by specific activities on campus.

4. Have institutions been prepared to enter more specific seminars with their own data to be used in problem-solving?

Data to test these hypotheses were collected in two steps. A brief activities check list (16 items) describing in technical language increasing levels of sophistication in marketing was sent to Directors of Admissions. Directors of Admissions were chosen because they were judged most likely to be involved directly in technical marketing activities and knowledgeable about the level of sophistication of others involved in marketing. They were randomly selected: 19 from institutions which had sent representatives to one or both of the seminars but had had no follow-up visits, 15 at institutions which had no contact with SCC regarding marketing. Instructions on the activities check list were to mark all activities which occurred on their campus since July 1976.

Eleven of 19 in the first group responded by checking on the average 7.2 of the 16 items. Twelve of 15 in the second group checked 7.1 items on the average. Items checked by 2/3 or more of the respondents in each group were those which indicate the start of systematic marketing.

ITEM	Frequency Checked	
	SCC CONTACT N=11	NO SCC CONTACT N=12
The significant publics of your college have been identified.	8	8
The significant markets of your college have been identified.	11	10
A person or group has been assigned responsibility to coordinate the marketing effort at your college.	7*	9
Key administrators are familiar with the technical terminology of marketing.	7*	4*
Primary markets have been defined.	10	10
Secondary markets have been defined.	9	7*

*less than 2/3

Other items describing more advanced market analysis were, with the exception of two items, checked by far fewer than 2/3 of the respondents in both groups. Whatever other differences between these groups there might be, those who had SCC contact via the two marketing seminars did not report a markedly different pattern or level of marketing activity.

Responses to an open-ended item at the end of the questionnaire did differ between the two groups, those who attended the SCC seminars and those who did not. The item was, "Are there specific techniques, methods, or strategies of marketing about which you would like more information or training? If yes, which ones?" The 11 respondents from institutions which had SCC contact listed a total of 11 items of which 8 were requests for specific technical assistance. The 12 respondents from institutions with no SCC contact regarding marketing listed a total of 5 items of which one was a request for specific technical assistance. The other four either expressed a lack of understanding of the items in the check list or were general calls for help.

Following returns from the questionnaire, telephone interviews were conducted in three groups of schools: a) four which had been represented at the seminar and had had follow-up visits (three were judged to be making progress, one no progress); b) three which had been represented at the seminar, had no follow-up visit, and had checked the highest number of activities among those who returned the questionnaire; and c) two which had had no contact with SCC regarding marketing and had checked the highest number of activities among those who returned the questionnaire. These institutions were selected to explore these questions:

1. What activities define marketing on your campus (as in the check list)?

2. Who are the central figures?

3. What is your role?

4. How and where did you learn to do what you are doing in marketing?

5. What role, if any, did the SCC play in this learning?

6. What are the observable indicators of that involvement?

7. What are your plans for next steps in marketing?

8. How, specifically, might the SCC assist in these activities?

One to three persons were interviewed by telephone on each of 9 campuses (20 persons in all). These always included the Director of Admissions and/or Development Officer in combination with the OCC, President, or Vice President for Research.

The broad results of these interviews indicate the following:

Respondents at those schools with no SCC contact indicate no need for assistance with marketing and the elements of a reasonably advanced system. These seem to be the product of a single experienced person charged with the responsibility to build the system. They see SCC's work with data systems as important to their work in marketing. They have few specific requests for future assistance in marketing, but do make requests for assistance with general systems of management in all areas. (It is important to note that these respondents are from institutions which reported the most advanced level of activities in marketing. Many other respondents with no contact with SCC indicated little or no knowledge and a generalized need for assistance.)

Respondents from institutions which were represented at SCC seminars but had no follow-up visits indicate a different pattern. The Directors of Admissions at these institutions had indicated in the questionnaire a high level of activity in marketing. As compared to the preceding group, there appears to be less coherence in the activity and less clarity about the need for specific technical skills. For example, in one institution the President sees no coordinated effort but wants one to augment his personalized approach, while the Vice President of Development at the same college sees himself as the center of a coordinated effort. In another institution, marketing is equated with advertising or as something not being done but likely in the future, and in the other, as a fragmentary interest emerging because of enrollment declines.

These three colleges have people who have had prior learning about marketing, some of which has been applied by on-line administrators which probably accounts for the reported level of sophistication/activity. They have not, as institutions, moved toward systematic marketing analysis. The SCC's effect has been to spread awareness to key administrators. There are few specific events mentioned which suggest major impact as yet. Ideas about next steps are vague, uncertain, incomplete. That seems attributable to several different conditions -- to many other high priority items, insufficient time and energy to keep the shop running while simultaneously designing new systems, lack of "critical mass" to get a marketing approach moving, resistance by one or another critical person, etc. As a consequence, requests for SCC assistance are in other areas or are very general (e.g., we need help with admissions).

The group of institutions which were represented at seminars and which have had follow-up visits are different from the others which were interviewed in one important way. They report a lower than average level of sophistication/activity in regard to marketing. It seems then that concentrated TA efforts in this area have been directed to institutions which wanted and could use the assistance. Effectiveness is quite varied. Three patterns emerge: 1) At 2 of the 4 institutions, top administrators and those with responsibility agree as to need and level of effort, but newness of the effort leads to quite varied and unclear statements of what has been done, to what ends, and what will happen next. They report the same events but interpret them differently. This is a case of willing to move toward development and implementation of a program they see as essential, recognizing they have much to learn and will make mistakes along the way. 2) A second case is one in which top administrators report high levels of activity while on-line administrators report markedly less. The response of top administrators indicates a lack of understanding of the technical terms they use. This case suggests one in which the need is present, but where differences in perceptions as to whether or not the need is being met make coordination and systematic planning difficult. 3) The final case is one in which the on-line administrator is skilled, technically competent and doing, within the constraints of the position, what can be done to develop a marketing system. Top administrators neither recognize the need nor understand the potential of what is being done at the operating level. They talk vaguely about "considering" marketing for future development. In all four institutions there are occasional problems regarding the level of competence of individuals in one or another key position. This is one of the more sensitive issues to be faced in regard to marketing.

In these four institutions there is recognition of the SCC as being central to their learning. They identify specific events and outcomes as indicative of that learning. They point to specific next steps and make requests for future assistance.

Results of this assessment suggest these findings in relation to the issues and questions raised by the SCC staff.

1. Those who attended SCC seminars are no more active in marketing than those who did not attend. Among those who did not attend, there are institutions at high levels of activity/sophistication and others at a base-line condition. In these cases marketing was not of a high priority in the institutional growth plan. Those who attended SCC seminars are better able to articulate specific technical needs for assistance with marketing.

2. The latter finding suggests that those institutions which did attend the SCC seminars are better prepared for on-site consultation on marketing.

3. Institutions which received on-site consultation on marketing reflect increased activity but to a quite different extent from campus to campus. Impact ranged from the development of coordinated, directed activity to flat refusal by campus administrators that marketing is their need while those with on-line responsibility try to use as much SCC material as possible.

4. Following from the above, some institutions are ready for more specific marketing seminars on narrow topics, others need process consultation or general organizational development work, and others need basic seminars for key administrators such as those offered by the SCC last year.

In summary, this TA area suggests the complexity of attempting to deliver assistance with the development of systematic approaches to institutional development. Finding those who recognize the need, are willing to learn, and who operate in an institution where a climate supportive of learning can be developed is the problem faced. As indicated by progress at a number of institutions, at least a partial solution has been found. The data suggest that future strategies may have to be more varied to be responsive to the interaction of local conditions. Several suggestions for different strategies and delivery modes were offered by respondents. These suggest the need for an R&D, developmental component within the SCC staff to design TA delivery systems which respond to these multiple needs.

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

This technical assistance area encompasses a variety of activities designed to foster planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of institutional programs for faculty and administrator development. It includes, among others: instructional improvement, faculty and administrator evaluation (peer, student, self), personal growth and career/life planning for faculty and administrators, administrative and managerial skill training, and reward systems. Many institutions in the SCC concerned with professional development have been part of earlier funded projects sponsored by CASC. Others have launched their own programs. The range of activities and level of development among SCC schools is, as a consequence of the diversity of activities and prior involvement, quite broad.

A major issue raised by the SCC staff is that despite a high level of activity in this area prior to and during the existence of SCC, institutional programs appear to emphasize activity for activity's sake. There is a tendency to ape activities at other institutions whether they "fit" the home institution or not. Within most institutions, professional development activities taken as a whole lack an underlying rationale. They are not systematic. As a result, there is a tendency to use SCC workshops and on-campus consultation as short-term stimulants. There appears to be either unwillingness or inability to internalize the input into the development of a self-sustaining comprehensive program. The SCC staff speculates that this may result from a number of misconceptions about the purpose of professional development; organizational barriers to development of such programs; lack of faculty leadership in creating such programs; and general unwillingness to do professional development in ways that might be effective because of uncertainties regarding how administrators will use the program.

SCC activities during the year were designed to respond to this analysis. Two off-campus workshops were offered. They focused on planning for systematic faculty development and faculty evaluation. Both topics were seen as central to the development of rational systems. On-campus workshops were offered where the local situation seemed supportive of and ready for more systematic development. Topics were varied to suit the level of readiness and need on each campus (e.g., time management, committee structure, role of department chairpersons in faculty development, etc.).

The perception of the staff is that these workshops had mixed effects despite their generally good reception. The overall subjective assessment of impact by the staff suggests the need for greater emphasis on organizational development and continuation of work on systems for faculty evaluation integrated into the reward system and personal/professional growth.

Issues and questions identified for exploration in this assessment were:

1. Professional development includes activities far beyond the typical faculty development topics and delivery modes implying the need for a broader systems approach.

2. On-campus workshops focused on specific institutional issues are superior to off-campus workshops as a delivery mode.

3. How can you decide how much follow-up to workshops is adequate to support development?

4. Is multiple involvement across SCC TA areas integrated within institutions to affect professional development?

5. Barriers to implementation of professional development are organizational rather than conceptual or practical.

Data were collected to explore these issues in a series of telephone interviews. Eight institutions were identified as representing different levels of activity and/or readiness, levels of achievement, and levels of involvement in SCC professional development programs.

One to three persons were interviewed on each campus, 13 persons in all. Persons were chosen because of their involvement in and awareness of professional development on that particular campus. The roles filled by those interviewed were: faculty development (Director or Committee Chair), 5; OCC, 6; Dean, 2.

The interview covered these questions:

1. a. What activities have defined professional development on your campus this year?

   b. At what stage of development is your program?

   c. Assess the quality of your program (poor to superior - 5 point scale). What criteria did you use?

2. a. Did you use outside sources of expertise/information to assist you in your efforts this year? If yes, describe.

   b. What were the observable effects of these activities? Probe: SCC input; effect/benefit of off/on-campus workshops.

3. a. What was the role of SCC staff beyond the above, if any? Probe: Impact on professional development.

4. a. Reviewing your activities in professional development and your progress, what was particularly helpful, what hindered?

   b. Judge the suitability of intensity and frequency of follow-up by SCC staff.

   c. Are there things the SCC staff might have done but didn't?

5. a. Do you have plans for professional development in 1978-79?

   b. Identify the two or three most important things SCC can do to assist your work in professional development.

This summary of results focuses on each of the five issues/questions:

1. Professional development on these campuses includes 17 different categories of activity either completed, in progress, or in planning. Those most frequently cited were:

	Number of times cited by 13 respondents.
Faculty evaluation and growth contracts	13
Curriculum, course design	11
Administrator skill training	9
Instructional improvement	6
Developing structure for faculty ownership and direction of faculty development	6
Specific institutional focus (Bible, community, institutional challenges, etc.)	6
Workshops/retreats for awareness	5

Other categories include MIS, LRP, student advising, communication, committee structure, proposal writing, special projects (grants), fringe benefits as rewards for faculty development, organizational interventions, morale, and student development.

There is a wide range of diverse activity under the broad label, professional development. This creates a management problem of TA delivery in this area which might be solved by a systems approach.

2. Reaction to on- and off-campus workshops does not confirm the staff hypothesis. Eleven of thirteen respondents saw marked advantages for off-campus workshops under proper conditions. Conditions were: appropriate purpose, adequate preparation, team attendance, provision for report back to broader community. All saw the advantage of on-campus workshops as offering the possibility of including more actors. Everyone reported disadvantages to both locations. The conclusion is that there are special circumstances and conditions under which either form of delivery can be effective or ineffective. Anticipating those conditions further complicates TA delivery in this area.

3. Present level of intensity and frequency of staff involvement was seen as adequate. One institution just starting in professional development with no prior experience wanted much more contact. Several respondents noted with appreciation the low pressure approach of the SCC in this area, available and responsive when called for, neither heavy handed nor directive. Arranged dates for telephone consultation after on-campus visits was reported as useful. Again, there is no clear cut answer.

4. Because of the emergence of administrator development as an important part of professional development, there are more connections to other TA areas (MIS, management, admissions). In several instances faculty development has shifted toward curriculum development, although there appears to be less coordination with other SCC activity in this relationship.

Problems with integration of faculty development into an institutional system of professional development abound. One institution reported itself as at the implementation stage of a system. One institution has barely begun. All others report that they are engaged in fragmentary activities which are not connected.

Overall self-ratings of professional development programs by institutional respondents are skewed toward the high end of the scale (averaging between Good and Very Good) as compared to SCC staff ratings of the same programs. This difference appears to be attributable to differences in criteria. The staff emphasizes a system; the institutional respondents emphasize quality of activities or programs or, perhaps, rate of progress.

5. Barriers to development of professional development programs were reported as follows:

	Number of times cited by 13 respondents.
Administrative problems, structure, past history.	12
Threat of evaluation.	8
Time and energy limitations.	7
Lack of direction (misdirection)	7
Faculty resistance or indifference	6

Nine other barriers were mentioned 4 or fewer times: poor image, poor morale, lack of evaluation (i.e., of demonstrable impact), faculty authority and responsibility unclear, waiting, communication problems, provincialism, lack of funds, and no spread of effect.

Facilitators include:

	Number of times cited by 13 respondents.
Administrative support of president and dean.	8
External grants.	7
SCC and CASC	3

Eleven other conditions were mentioned.

Identification of needs for SCC assistance include:

	Number of times cited by 13 respondents.
Help with evaluation, growth contracts.	13
Help with curriculum, course, instructional development.	13
Administrative skills.	4
General consultation.	4
Better, more timely information from SCC.	3
Develop team effort.	2
Don't know.	3

These institutions were selected to represent the range of advancement in professional development and SCC involvement. The results confirm that they are distributed according to staff judgment. Thus, it is likely that the picture of professional development generated by these interviews can be generalized. Taken together, the interviews say that professional development in these institutions is characterized by: activity (of varying degrees of intensity) in many diverse areas; lack of systematic development of high impact; multiple delivery modes seen as effective; barriers of an organizational and interpersonal nature; and needs expressed in all but one institution in terms of programs or activities, not systems.

The implications for SCC TA delivery are fairly clear. There are needs for assistance with diverse problems to be delivered by a variety of strategies. There is no clear answer as to how limited staff resources can be used most effectively. Institutional respondents confirm staff suspicions in numerous quotations: "Faculty development has amounted to almost nothing." "We've used the wrong approach for years, too personalized, voluntary, no administrative support." "Faculty resistance to any evaluation, any development, suggests a low key, voluntary approach." From the detailed comments one can infer that faculty evaluation is perceived by some faculty as being equated with an attempt to increase productivity or eliminate unproductive faculty. The statements of need imply that faculty development is often equated with moving faculty to new areas (e.g., cooperative education, continuing education, career education, programs for new clientele, etc.) against their will. There are undoubtedly elements of these concerns in all professional development programs.

Under these conditions an integrated, holistic approach to professional development appears to require a solution for systemic problems. Present activities can help solve particular technical problems (e.g., how to get started, how to plan, the range of possible evaluation programs, etc.) or with the development of specific programs when institutions are ready. The instances of institutions moving into a system of professional development or who are prepared to do so is vanishingly small.